CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY, 1936. Vol. XXVI.

A TRADITIONALIST CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIAN MODERNISM

By The Editor.

MR. E. H. Blakeney, a retired master of Winchester College, delivers in the *Hibbert Journal* for July, 1936, a direct challenge to Modernist Christians. He writes:

> 'While sympathetic with all that is best in 'Modernism,' I have long had an uneasy feeling that, argue as we may, the Liberal-Modernist programme is not really consistent with the plain teaching of the Gospel *as we have it set forth in the pages of the Evangelists.*'

Mr. Blakeney points to seven instances of this conflict between Modernist views and the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels literally interpreted. These are:

(1) *The Miraculous.*

'The whole Gospel narrative from start to finish is saturated with the miraculous.'

(2) *Eternal Punishment.*

'It is not fair to deny the doctrine of Eternal Punishment on the one hand, and yet claim loyalty to the teaching of Jesus on the other, for the simple reason that He taught that doctrine not obliquely but directly. It is there, in the Gospel, and as much a part of His teaching as the forgiveness of sins or the fatherhood of God.'

(3) *'The number of the lost will greatly exceed that of the saved.'*

(4) *Belief in demon-possession.*

'Nor is it right to dismiss, lightly or contemptuously, the belief in demon-possession, for the Gospels are full of instances showing, beyond the reach of doubt, that Jesus firmly believed in it: else why the miracles of "exorcism" which meet us everywhere in the Gospel?'

(5) *Personality of Satan.*

'Do not let us imagine for a moment that Jesus did not assert it.'

(6) *'A literal "coming again" of the crucified Christ.'*

(7) *'A literal bodily resurrection for all mankind.'*

Mr. Blakeney asserts roundly that it is not open to those who deny these things

'to designate their new doctrine as *Christian,* in any proper sense of the term. Nor is it honest. The only possible way to get rid of the old teaching is to show that we cannot any longer rely on the Gospel narratives at all: and if Christianity be *not* founded on those narratives, on what basis, pray, is it to be founded?

. . . What I do protest against is in allowing ourselves to be deluded into supposing that it is the Gospel of Jesus or the Christianity of the Apostolic Church. It is not straightforward on anybody's part to pretend that it is so. The fact is we shall have to make the great decision, either to accept the plain unvarnished unaccommodating Gospel, or to become frank Modernists. And Modernist Christianity is not the Christianity of Christ at all. To that impasse are we brought.'

This four-square Gospel of Christianity, if it is to be taken as valid, pre-supposes that the Gospels are literally accurate accounts of the teaching and actions of Jesus. This conclusion, modern source-criticism and form-criticism of the Gospels shew not to be the case. In a number of instances both as regards the actual sayings and doings of Jesus, the Gospel accounts are in conflict, and this demonstrates that they are not literally accurate records. If for instance we compare the Gospel accounts of the denials of St. Peter, the inscription on the cross, what happened at the sepulchre on the first Easter Day, St. Matthew's and St. Luke's accounts of the Nativity and Infancy, we find ourselves faced with irreconcilable contradictions.

Mr. Blakeney's challenge assumes that not only everything that Jesus taught but everything that Jesus believed must be believed by those who are loyal Christians. Bishop Gore and his *Lux Mundi* colleagues came to the conclusion, and it is a demonstrably sound conclusion, that Jesus was ignorant of the results, 'the assured results,' of Old Testament criticism, and

that His recorded teaching actually contradicts these results. For instance, Jesus believed, if we interpret the Gospels literally, that David wrote Psalm 110: but Charles Gore, as the result of his critical studies, was convinced that David did not write Psalm 110. Jesus believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch from *Genesis* to *Deuteronomy*: the Higher Critics can produce a mass of evidence against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. In these matters, which are we to believe?

Our reason compels us to agree in their main conclusions with the critics. For it is clear that in these matters the critics know more than Jesus knew. His knowledge, generally speaking, was in these matters the knowledge of His age and country. But the crucial question is this: Is it disloyal to Jesus, as Mr. Blakeney seems to assume, to disbelieve in these matters what Jesus believed and to believe what modern literary and historical criticism teaches? We who are Modernists hold that it would be disloyal to Jesus not to believe the Higher Critics.

We are convinced that Jesus was above all things loyal to the truth, although His knowledge of the truth in the sphere of criticism, as in many other spheres, was limited, and that no one can rightly claim to be a loyal disciple of Jesus who does not make loyalty to the truth a fundamental principle of his thought and life.

It is quite probably the case that Jesus did believe in demons: that He believed in the personality of Satan: that He believed that in response to human prayer and human need His Divine Father could and would break through the uniformity of nature. It is not so probable that He believed in the everlasting torment of the wicked. Does it follow that we must hold similar beliefs if we would be loyal to Him? Most certainly not, if the evidence, so far as we have been able to investigate and estimate it, is insufficient to make these things credible for us. We have no right, as Christians, to throw over the authority of our rational, moral and spiritual consciousness and believe something in conflict with it, on the ground that Jesus taught it or that the Christian Church has believed it since the beginning. To do that is to be a bad Christian. Each human being possesses and shares in the Divine Nature, and his primal loyalty is to that Eternal

Light within him 'which lighteneth every man.' 'Reason,' wrote Bishop Butler, 'is the candle of the Lord within us and that by which we must judge even of Revelation itself.' The Cambridge Platonists, in harmony with the great Christian Platonic tradition which goes back to the second century of our era, taught the same. To deny the supreme authority of the Divine Light within us is to be disloyal to a right faith in the presence and power of the Holy Spirit and that progressive revelation of the truth of which the Fourth Gospel speaks:

> 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth . . . All things whatsoever that the Father hath are mine; therefore said I, that he taketh of mine, and shall declare it unto you' (Jn. xvi, 12, 13, 15).

The true significance of this passage would seem to be that in the sphere of moral and spiritual truth, a progressive unveiling may be, nay must be, looked for, but that future progressive revelation will not conflict with what is essential in the teaching of Jesus. It will not overthrow it: it will advance from it and through it. We do not, as Modernists, wish to avoid crucial issues by using the term 'essential teaching' of Jesus. Dr. Hastings Rashdall, in his volume *Conscience and Christ*, and in his opening essay in the volume *Principles and Precepts*, indicates with cogency and conviction that it is loyalty to the principles, not necessarily to the precepts, of Jesus which is demanded of Christians. It is these principles which constitute the essential element in His Gospel.

If any man can persuade himself to-day that the literal 'coming again' of the crucified Christ, by which is meant no doubt His coming again to earth in bodily form as predicted by the two angels in *Acts* i, 11, is part of the essential Gospel, although it is not certain that Jesus predicted it, and that if He did predict it, then it was to take place within the lifetime of those who heard the prediction, then we suppose that without being disloyal to Jesus he may believe in it. Nevertheless, such a belief for those who have made a critical study of it, is impossible to-day: so also with regard to belief in a 'literal bodily resurrection for all mankind.' The Gospel evidence makes it more than doubtful, if Jesus ever taught such a bodily resurrection, although it was a belief held generally by His Pharisaic Jewish contemporaries,

and has been held by the vast majority of Christians for 1,800 years,[1] yet if one of our Christian fundamentalists believes it to be an essential doctrine of Jesus and something which is not incredible, then he may profess it as a loyal Christian. But for those who not only hold the evidence to be against Jesus having taught it and that even if He taught it, it is not only a non-essential element in the doctrine of a future life, but also incredible in the light of a modern scientific knowledge of the Universe, then as a loyal Christian he ought not to hold it, for as Tertullian wrote about 200 A.D. in a memorable sentence: Christ called Himself the Truth; He did not call Himself Tradition.

When Mr. Blakeney writes that Jesus taught 'Eternal Punishment' directly and that it is as much a part of His teaching as the Fatherhood of God and the Forgiveness of Sins, Modernists will ask: Have we any right to interpret the teaching of Jesus about 'Eternal Punishment' in such a way as to conflict with a true belief in the Fatherhood of God and in the Forgiveness of Sins? It is this which much traditionalist teaching about 'Eternal Punishment' has done. It has reduced the Fatherhood of God to unreality and the Forgiveness of Sins to a travesty. No Modernist denies that in the future state we shall and must suffer if suffering be necessary to promote our moral and spiritual progress: in short that 'eternal punishment' is not everlasting but is reformative, educative, and must *end* in the salvation of the sufferer.

As to the question of the number of the saved being far less than the number of the lost, the evidence of the Gospels is conflicting. It seems possible that Jesus did not teach, as has been asserted, that 'the Narrow Way will never be crowded,' but simply that as a matter of fact it was not crowded at the time that He was speaking. Other religious parties and their propaganda were securing much popular support: He, with His Gospel of the Kingdom, was securing very little. Whether that would be so for ever, He did not predict. When one asked Him: Are there few that be saved? He gave no direct answer but uttered a very practical exhortation: Strive ye to enter in at the strait gate. Jesus certainly taught no Gospel easy to practise,

[1] See my *Resurrection of Relics* (Basil Blackwell).

although there is good critical evidence for believing Him to have said : My yoke is easy and my burden is light, which is no doubt to be interpreted as meaning, that His Gospel was not, like the teaching of contemporary Pharisaism, concerned with the multitude of irksome regulations but went to the very heart of human nature and inspired that nature to realize itself in the uplifting and all-absorbing life of love to God and love to man. When Jesus was asked : What is the nature of the great commandment, He replied in those ever-memorable words :

> 'The first and great commandment is this, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and the second is like unto it : thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself ; upon these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.'

He did not reply : Thou shalt believe in the four-square Gospel literally interpreted which I am going to give as a rule of faith and obedience to my disciples.

Mr. Blakeney has done well in bringing into the clear light of day traditionalist Christianity in opposition to modernist Christianity. The traditionalist Christian will no doubt continue to affirm : I must believe in everlasting perdition for the great majority of mankind ; I must believe in the bodily return of Jesus upon the clouds to judge the world ; I must believe in the bodily resurrection from their graves of the innumerable dead because Jesus is recorded in the four Gospels, as literally interpreted, to have taught these things. And the traditionalist Christian may go on and add, I must believe that Adam and Eve ate the apple in the Garden of Eden and so brought physical death into the world : that human women have been, and are, a means of sensual temptation to the angels : that Jesus offered up an expiatory sacrifice on the Cross to the Divine Father, because St. Paul taught these things. But such beliefs, and such reasons for them, will carry no weight whatsoever with the Christian Modernist in view of the Modernist's belief as to what constitutes the essential Gospel of Jesus and what is the message of the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit to mankind to-day. The obscurantist, static, literalist, legalist, conception of Divine truth the Christian Modernist regards as utterly alien to the Spirit of Jesus and as something which he is consecrated to extirpate if he be loyal to his Master. In this connection we com-

mend to the consideration of traditionalist Christians the following passage from the recently published Noble Lectures of Archbishop William Temple entitled *The Church and its Teaching To-day.*[2]

> 'It is, of course, a familiar fact that when the physical presence of our Lord was withdrawn at the time of the Ascension, what remained in the world as the fruit of His sojourn here was not an organized society with constitution and rules; nor was it a book which He had written for the guidance of His disciples; but it was a group of disciples united to one another by their common allegiance to Him. It was a living fellowship. And that is not without connection with the whole nature of the work that He Himself had come to do.
>
> 'Let us imagine what the situation would have been if He had in fact written a book that should contain His teachings for His followers. For all those who accepted His divine mission that book would have an absolute and completely binding authority. No doubt there would arise, especially as circumstances altered with the changing times, a need for interpretation, but so far as the meaning was ascertained, the authority would be complete and final. To exercise any freedom of judgment in relation to what was thus laid down would be almost equivalent to the setting up of the individual conscience against the utterance of incarnate God.
>
> 'It is, therefore, of the very utmost importance to notice that our Lord did not take steps to provide for the fellowship of His disciples an exact record, in terms fixed by Himself, of the principles which were to guide them. But He left in the world a fellowship of people who had been His companions, who had come under His influence, who had begun to understand His work and person, who became His interpreters to the world. And for that reason there remains scope for freedom of intellectual activity in relation to the story of His life and teaching.'

The spirit of freedom, truth and love, so critical investigation attests, is of the very essence of the personality and mission of Jesus, and it is by our unflinching loyalty to that spirit that we prove ourselves to be true Christians. Whosoever hath not the Spirit of Christ, said St. Paul, is none of His. This is a surer test of a true Christian, combined with that other test which Jesus gave: 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' than the holding of a number of antiquated beliefs such as Mr. Blakeney selects which, in some cases, are in conflict, not only with our scientific knowledge of the Universe, but also in conflict with our profoundest moral and spiritual convictions of the true nature of the Divine Father whom Jesus unveiled in the very centre of His Gospel.

[2] *The Church and its Teaching to-day.* By William Temple, Achbishop of York. (Macmillan and Co. 1936. Price 4/6.)

WHO IS GOD?*

By the Very Rev. W. R. MATTHEWS, D.D., K.C.V.O., Dean of St. Paul's.

'God is love: and he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him.'—I John iv, 16.

TO-DAY we are summoned to reflect upon the doctrine of the Trinity, that tenet of orthodox Christianity which has been variously regarded as the chief glory of the Christian theology or as the chief obstacle to belief and the surest mark for the sneers of those who have revolted from it. It is to be feared that, to the ordinary Christian, Trinity Sunday comes as an anti-climax. After the thrill of the great festivals: the coming of the dayspring from on high at Christmas, the victory over sin and death of Easter, the acclamation of the Heavenly King at Ascensiontide, and the dramatic birth of the New Israel at Pentecost, the theme of to-day seems to be an abstract and abstruse dogma, remote from human life, the invention of theologians who might have been more usefully employed in putting into practice the simple gospel of the fatherhood of God. How far have we come from the plain message that God is love! Something of this sort may be the impression made when we dwell on the dry and technical terms in which the doctrine has been stated; but if we pierce behind these phrases and seek for the motive which produced them and the experience which gave them birth, we shall, I think, revise our opinion. We shall cease to contrast the simple gospel of the love of God with the complicated theory of the Trinity, and shall admit, what is indeed the truth, that this doctrine is the consequence of belief in the divine love, and that it is the great and necessary safeguard that it shall be neither distorted nor abandoned.

The New Testament announces that God is our Father, and that the Power within the universe is Love, with such calm assurance that we are tempted to overlook the astounding, the paradoxical nature of these assertions. In the New Testament they are, in fact, not subjects of debate, not questions which

*A sermon preached on Trinity Sunday, 1936, in New College Chapel before the University of Oxford.

admit of argument. Other problems there are, such as the providence of God in His dealing with the Jews, the place of good works in salvation; but the love of God is for the Apostolic Church not a problem but a fact. For the earliest Church the coming of the Son, Jesus Christ, was sufficient evidence. 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.' In the wonder of that gift the obstinate questionings which have vexed the mind of humanity concerning the existence and the nature of God died away. They saw the love of God in the face of Jesus Christ. The doctrine of the Trinity is the attempt to preserve the ground of that primitive Christian assurance, which was the mainspring of the new life, and to transmit it to subsequent ages. It is the affirmation that it was really the Son of God who came. The person who suffered and died for us was not merely a representative of God, not simply 'one of the prophets,' but the Word of God incarnate, and therefore Calvary was not just a martyrdom, like many another, but the costly and gracious act of God. The motive behind the doctrine of the Trinity is, moreover, one which rises out of the heart of practical day by day Christian living. The saving act of God in Christ was not only a dramatic intervention, completed once for all in time. It has effects which do not diminish as the event recedes into the past. The Son, who came once in the flesh, is present always, through the Spirit, who is shed abroad in the hearts of believers, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. Hence we may assert that the two propositions, 'God is Love' and 'I believe in Father, Son and Holy Spirit, three Persons in one God,' sounding so different, are not opposed or contrasted; they do not even belong to two different spheres of thought. The second is the consequence of the first.

God is love. The significance of the assertion is worth attention, since it has been variously interpreted. The word 'love' is probably one of the most ambiguous words in any language; it conveys meanings which lie very far apart. They range from almost crude physical passion to the affectionate benevolence of St. Francis. The history of religion is full of 'gods of love' whom it would be as absurd as it would be blasphemous to compare with the Holy God of Judaism and Christianity. We have said, in effect, almost nothing when we affirm that God is love,

unless we go on to define more precisely what we mean by 'love' in this context.

It is well known that the language of the New Testament does not employ the ordinary Greek word for love, ἔρως, but adopts another, ἀγάπη, which has few associations outside the sphere of Christian usage. It would be true to say that the earliest preachers of the gospel required a new word because what they had to impart was a new meaning, a new quality of life. Recently some Christian scholars have emphasized the difference between the two kinds of love represented by the two words ἔρως and ἀγάπη so forcibly as to make it a contrast or even a contradiction. This, I think, is an exaggeration. But there must be some reason for the new word, and it is doubtless that the common phrase had associations which were considered unworthy or misleading. There can be little question what these associations were. Always the word ἔρως contains the element of desire. In its lowest significance, it indicates the passionate impulsion which urges the animals together in the instinct of sex. It is of course true that love in this sense may be the spring of great heights of mystical experience. The heavenly ἔρως, the thirst for the Real and Eternal world which is at the core of Platonism, may originate from the instinctive desires which we share with other animals, or at least it may have some evolutionary connexion with the instincts, but in itself it is something quite different, a spiritual impulse and a spiritual experience. Yet even on this highest level, where the mystic seeks union with the divine, this element of desire is present and is even predominant. 'Thou still undaunted daughter of desire,' sings the poet of St. Teresa, with exact psychological truth. The self seeks its good, it craves for its own completion and its own perfect satisfaction — even though that completion and satisfaction consists in being lost, swallowed up in the ocean of the being of God. This kind of love is at the root of all mystical experience; and it accounts for a strange phenomenon which is exhibited by almost every great mystic, the 'wooing' note in their devotion, as if the Divine had to be persuaded, even induced to enter the soul of the devotee.

I would not be misunderstood. I am not urging that this kind of mystical devotion is unchristian or in any sense to be

deprecated. I am far from agreeing with some Protestant theologians that mystical piety is essentially pagan. 'Whom have I in Heaven but Thee and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee.' It would be an intolerable paradox to forbid these words to Christian lips or the sentiment they express to Christian hearts. But nevertheless the New Testament conception of love does not, on the whole, develop along these lines. The note of satisfaction for the self is not struck as a dominant tone, the element of passion and desire is not prominent. On the contrary, the Christian idea of love is first of all that of a disposition which 'seeketh not its own.' It is that of an attention and interest turned away from the self and towards the neighbour and the other.

Love, as it is used in the New Testament, is concerned not primarily with desire or emotion but with will. This surely is evident when we consider the facts. If there is one fundamental and characteristic principle of Christian ethics it is that 'love is the fulfilling of the law.' All the commandments are 'briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' The widespread suspicion that Christian morality is either impracticable or irrelevant is partly due to a mistaken notion of what love means in these precepts. It is supposed that we are enjoined to feel a warm emotion of affection towards all, and it is pretty obvious that this is impossible. The strange and secret motions of our heart go out towards one and are not to be forced to stretch out towards another. We have little power over them. It would indeed be absurd to propose as the basis of the good life that we should feel an impulse of affection towards all, that we should long for all men to be with us and find joy always in their company. But if love means something different, if it means a disposition of the will, the absurdity is removed, and the principle becomes intelligible and practicable. Though our emotions may be as inconstant as the wind, our will may be as steady as the ground over which it blows. Christian love, the foundation principle of Christian living, means then a steady and resolute disposition of the will to seek and promote the good of all with whom we are in relation. It is independent of liking or disliking, of attraction or repulsion; it is a moral principle first, not a sentiment.

Though Christian love is not an emotional state but a disposition of the will, we must beware of falling into the opposite error of supposing that it has nothing to do with the affections. Human nature is of one piece, and a man is not an assembly of faculties working in isolation. A settled will for the good of others cannot leave the emotions unaffected. It is a truth to which much experience bears witness, that one who steadily wills the good of others, and turns his attention and interest towards them, grows more tolerant, finds less that repels in his fellows and more that attracts, and often in seeking and desiring their good discovers that there is cause for admiration and affection in them which he had not noticed before. So not infrequently ἔρως may grow out of ἀγάπη, affection out of good-will; and I suppose that the perfect development of the human spirit would be one in which the distinction between the two kinds of love was abolished and good-will went with warm affection towards all our fellows.

We have the authority of reason as well as of revelation for thinking that the highest human qualities are the best clue which we can have for understanding the goodness of God. 'He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, for God is love.' We may surely deduce from that saying the conclusion that the love of God must be analogous to the love which is the noblest we can experience. The centre of the Christian gospel is the belief that the love of Christ manifests the love of the Father, and that the seeking and indomitable love of Jesus is the revelation of the nature of the Divine.

John Stuart Mill, in a famous passage, refused to use the word 'good' of God unless the word meant what it means when we apply it to human character; and indeed we must all agree that it would be foolish to bedeck the Eternal with honorific terms which have no significance. The difficulty of supposing that God exercises the cardinal virtues, that He is courageous, or temperate, is familiar enough, but it vanishes if we admit that the ground and principle of all goodness is love and that love is the fulfilling of the law. There is no absurdity in supposing the Creator has a steady will for the good of His creatures.

Let us apply the idea of love as we have analysed it to the understanding of our text. Much theological discussion of the

love of God has become entangled in the paradox that He can love only what is good, and hence, in the last resort, can love only Himself, since none is good but God. If we retain the New Testament conception of love, we shall avoid the surely intolerable conclusion that the divine love is wholly self-love. On the contrary, God loves us with ἀγάπη, the essential meaning of His love is that this is a settled and unalterable will for our good, for the good not only of humanity as a whole, but of each particular person, of the sheep of the flock whom He calls by name.

No one who has ever tried to love another human being in the true manner would ever confound it with easy-going complacency. If I will the true good of my friend, I may have to appear to him as a critic, an obstacle in his chosen path, a spoiler of his joy, even as an adversary. So when we think rightly of the love of God we find no contradiction with the belief in His holiness. If I am, with blinded eyes, seeking some end which is not my good, or rushing along some way which is not the way of life, the love of God, which constantly and relentlessly seeks my true good, and to direct me in the path of life, must appear to me an opposition, and my eternal Friend disguised as my unseen enemy.

The love, even the purest Christian love, of human beings for one another is necessarily imperfect. Not only are our wills unstable and subject to the daily temptation of selfishness, we have imperfect insight so that we often know not what we should desire either for ourselves or for our friends. In the love of God for us these imperfections are abolished and the perfect love is fulfilled. The Eternal Good knows with complete and unclouded apprehension the nature of good, and He knows also the particular good works which He has prepared for each of His children to walk in. He knows the place which He has reserved for me in the Kingdom, the individual and unique work which I have to do, and He will not rest until I have found my rest in the appointed labour.

In some way such as this may we interpret the gospel proclamation that God is love. We need not conceal the fact that we can accept this message as truth for us only by an act of faith. Never can we demonstrate it beyond possibility of doubt.

It remains an affirmation of the spiritual man in opposition to the surface aspect of things, contradicted to appearance by the evil and suffering in the world. What could be said on that topic belongs to another enquiry.

Here in conclusion we must note that the apprehension of God and of God as love, the gift of faith, is by the New Testament writers conceived as depending more upon moral sensitiveness than on intellectual acuteness. 'He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God'; not he that hath great dialectical powers, not even he that hath wonderful mystical experiences. There are, I suppose, many in these days who long for the assurance that God is a reality and not a fiction, and the lover of men, but who are looking for that spiritual assurance in the wrong place. They turn over the arguments for and against the Christian belief in God, 'and find no end in wandering mazes lost'; or they seek for some overwhelming religious experience which will sweep doubt away, only to be haunted by the suspicion that this experience when it comes is nothing but a drama played on the stage of their own minds. 'He that loveth not knoweth not God'; 'He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God.' The guidance which comes from the earliest days of our religion would not indeed lead us to despise intellectual enquiry and mystical vision, but it would not lead us to begin with them. It would tell us to start loving our fellows, to cultivate the settled and resolute will for their good. So by coming to know what love means we shall come to know what God means, and by realizing its power, its reality as a human force, we shall be in contact with a power which is more than human, with the creative energy of the world. 'Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is love.'

BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND THE INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

By Stanley A. Cook, Litt.D., F.B.A., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge.

*Second and concluding article.**

(7) Thanks to archaeology, comparative religion and the internal criticism of the Bible, we are gaining profounder conceptions of the great creative and history-making ages that can be recognized in and behind its contents. But the traditional way of regarding the Old Testament and that of Biblical Criticism are poles asunder. On the one view, the Pentateuch stands at the beginning of Israelite national history: Mosaism is something once and for all given to the saints of Israel; after several centuries it was, so to speak, endorsed by the prophets and at last reaffirmed by Ezra. But, however this view be expressed — and it is not easy to determine what its exponents hold — it is opposed absolutely by the other, which claims to answer the evidence and to be in harmony with usual historical processes. The familiar difference of opinion is an exceedingly important one. From time to time we may read of a 'return' to Primitive Christianity, to Pre-Reformation Catholicism, to Mediaeval Scholasticism, to Kant, or what not. Yet the only 'return' of any significance that could be cited as a precedent or a parallel would be the old traditional view of a Post-exilic 'return' to Mosaism. The critical 'evolutionary' view is admittedly incomplete; but Biblical scholars are confident that there was no 'return' to the Mosaism of eight, nine or ten centuries previously. On the other hand, reassertion and restatement are everyday phenomena: the old will constantly reappear in a new system or body; and those who in any way think of a 'return' or who maintain the traditional view of Mosaism and Ezra should consider what it is they really have in mind.

On the critical view, certain sweeping changes occurred in and about the sixth century B.C., though when it comes to details

* Dr. Cook's first article was published in the June *Modern Churchman*.—Ed.

there is difference of opinion. While everyone recognizes the historical significance of the first century A.D., that of the earlier prophetic movement should rank among the outstanding discoveries of modern research[11] — along with the decipherment of cuneiform. Both ages should be considered together, as far as possible, for their bearing upon the present age, which might usher in some new forward-reaching movement, or might haply witness a development as unsuspected as that when Christianity arose at the tragic end of the Jewish state in Palestine and in due course found a new field elsewhere.

With this question of a 'return' or a 'reassertion' are bound up questions of 'origins' and the search after 'nature' and the 'primitive.' Throughout we have to do with questions of evolution and/or revolution, new movements, and the 'reassertion' of the old in some new form. And the point to be stressed is that the Bible is a unique source for the examination of the profoundest (r)evolutionary processes known to us. Of the majestic evolution of the Universe we are learning something; but more immediately remarkable is that evolution of the human mind that could discover it, and that must now find a place for the Bible in its scheme of things.

(8) Christianity did not evolve naturally out of the thought of its age. It came 'from outside,' as it were, taking and transforming what it needed, and inaugurating a new line of development.[12] Like the prophets, their predecessors, there were men in opposition to their age, men who, like Amos (vii, 14), could disclaim spiritual kinship with its accredited representatives. Christianity was no ordinary synthesis of existing tendencies; there was no round-table conference. Nor can we describe the post-exilic reorganization of Israel as a synthesis of current trends of thought. Typical of the introduction of some new stage is not the judicious '*in medio tutissimus ibis*,' but '*this* is the way, walk ye in it.' The adjustments, combinations and

[11] The recognition of the exilic background of *Isaiah* xl-lxvi dates from 1775, but the first notable step was taken by Gesenius (1820-21).

[12] Roman Catholic and other writers opposed to modern Biblical Criticism are so far in harmony with Marxists that they recognise, instead of ordinary 'evolutionary' processes, the effects of transforming rather than reforming elements, and of discontinuities as well as continuities. — *Cf.* below on Darwin and Mendel, p. 186.

compromises come along later, as, *e.g.* when JE and D and P could be woven together in one book, the Pentateuch — much lies behind that! — or when a Canon is definitely fixed.[13] But, typically, a choice has to be made, even as when Wellhausen by his famous *Prolegomena* (1878) forced all serious students to take up their stand 'for or against,' and a veritable revolutionary *volte-face* — as regards the position of P's narratives — became an 'evolutionary' process.[14]

A comparative study of the inauguration and early course of strikingly new movements or transformations in thought proves helpful in many ways. We may think of the pioneers, the voices crying in the wilderness, the heterodoxies of one day which often very rightly remained the heterodoxies of the morrow, and at last, in the fulness of time, the successful inaugurator or inaugurators. There are the times when the least adherent of the new order is greater than the greatest of the rival, and the worst enemy of the cause is he who, to the outsider at least, seems to be of the same household. There are the usual misunderstandings and premature compromises, the fear of 'reaction,' and that apparent 'reaction' which is a legitimate and necessary reassertion of the old, a *bona-fide* adjustment of the old and the new. Throughout, wherever there is (r)evolution in thought, in research, in social-political crises, or in the history of religion, we deal with comparable processes, and we find that what occurs in one field will often prove helpful and suggestive when we consider another.

(9) Let us pursue this further. (*a*) The successful movement requires its appropriate environment. The Second Isaiah is of the same general period as Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy; the rise of Christianity is illumined by Philo, the Psalms of Solomon and other writings; and there were tendencies towards the present Old Testament literary-critical position before Wellhausen wrote in 1878. There are the difficult situations in social, political or intellectual fields when men 'heal the hurt too

[13] There are well-known cases of compromise also in the history of the post-exilic priesthood.

[14] It is difficult for us to realise how revolutionary the step seemed to those outside the ranks. Orr speaks of Graf's 'somersault' and of the 'development, if that can be termed development, which is more properly *revolution*' (*Problem of the Old Testament* [1905], p. 199).

lightly' (*Jer.* vi, 14); their solutions are premature, inadequate or impermanent. But (*b*) when once the new movement has started, it may be too individualistic; it rests upon too narrow a basis, and is more suited for a specialized group than for the community as a whole.[15] As it progresses, the earliest stages may be superseded; like Astruc's theory of J and E, they have played their part. So the movement will pass over into a new phase, as when Mendelism becomes the successor of Darwinism, and transformations, mutations and discontinuities become recognized factors in (r)evolution. Interesting and comparable questions arise, also, when we consider those who carry on the 'tradition': Marx and his successors, orthodox and unorthodox, and the question of the relation between the age of Wellhausen and the Biblical critics of this century.[16]

Now (*c*) when a movement has a broader basis and appeals to a wider circle, the needs of less detached and less specialized minds must be satisfied. Elements of the old and now superseded order re-enter, though in a new form, as part of an entirely new system or organism. In Old Testament criticism the earlier and wider point of view of Ewald, Stanley and other writers was followed by the narrower, more intensive and indispensable work of literary-historical criticism. It has proved to be a necessary stage, and the present tendency to extend our survey makes the post-Wellhausen stage in certain respects recall the pre-Wellhausen stage, with the vastly important difference that, thanks to the Wellhausen stage with its literary criticism and the general progress of thought, we can see things in a way that Ewald, Stanley and their age could never have foreseen.[17] In fact, one now finds that one can often gain hints

[15] *Cf.* the difference between the two types of Buddhism, the Hīnayāna and the Mahāyāna. The difference between the reforming individualistic prophets and post-exilic Judaism as a social-religious organism is discussed later.

[16] Not without analogy, too, is the fact that the second phase does not come at once. Mendel published his experiments in 1865, but the significance of his work was not recognized by biologists until 1900, eighteen years after his death.

[17] See Stanley, *Jewish Church,* Vol. III, Preface, p. xvii, and especially Chapters LV sq., where, in his survey of the exilic period, he glances at Zoroaster, China, India and Greece, and devotes several pages to Socrates. With this compare R. Kittel's *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel* (1929), iii, Section 56.

from the earlier if not 'pre-critical' writers on the Old Testament, and it is even useful to ask oneself whether some thoroughly antiquated phase, *e.g.* the importance formerly attached to typology, really belongs to the past or is only an antiquated form of something that can and should be reinterpreted.[18] Earlier intuitions, earlier phases, may or may not be worth reconsidering, and the history of research, at least, shows that the line between legitimate and illegitimate scepticism can rarely be justly drawn.[19]

Here the point I am making is the way in which in the course of development a new stage leaves on one side elements which it finds irrelevant but which later on may prove to have a new or another value. For example, Mediaeval Scholasticism represents the mentality of a bygone and pre-Reformation age, but there are in it certain features which can be reinterpreted and restated. It represents genuine and necessary research — this is often forgotten — but the particular questions we ask, and the sort of answers that would alone satisfy modern knowledge, would make a gulf between the Scholasticism of the past and any new system that should replace it.[20]

(*d*) A new movement is a force that requires a field, an environment. It may create it by forceful proselytizing, by ruthless suppression of antagonistic influences, or by capturing the hearts of the young and the impressionable. Even if it creates its environment the varied needs of its members are not necessarily satisfied.[21] There may be fallow ground to be broken up (*Jer.* iv, 3). In Israel the exilic period was one of ethnical, political and social changes, fitted for the breaking down of an old order and the introduction of a new one. Also the rise of Christianity was, as the pages of Josephus testify, at a time of

[18] Here I would only refer interested readers to A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy,* Chapter xii ('Typology in Nature and Revelation').

[19] For example, some of Sayce's brilliant surmises have been justified — but only some. The earlier suspicion of Assyriology was by no means always misplaced. To give a thoroughly topical case, I may refer to the Ras Shamra tablets, some of the interpretations of which I must confess that I view with the utmost reserve — rightly or wrongly.

[20] The question of the prospects of Neo-Scholasticism is therefore an interesting one; see further, below, p. 168, on new patches and new garments.

[21] Does Communism satisfy the religious needs of its members? Communists themselves are in two minds over the cult of Lenin.

grave internal crises. But the new religion could not find a lasting environment in Palestine or in the East; and now the West, after becoming Christianized, has to face the problem of a new adjustment between some form of Christianity and some stable environment. Both the 'force' and the 'field' are necessary.

(*e*) A new movement needs new clothes; it looks with suspicion upon new patches on old garments. The actual results are interesting when one considers early Jewish as distinct from Gentile Christianity, or the distrust of the thorough-going Communist for the *bourgeois* and 'tame' Socialist. Here the question of 'short circuits' is particularly instructive, for the men who 'pick up' a new body of thought without 'going through the mill' often know neither the *rationale* nor the strength or weakness of their position. There are many who know something about J, E, D and P, but scarcely understand the implications of the literary-critical hypothesis they have accepted. In like manner, are there not those who genuinely hold religious beliefs, though of an isolated and rather miscellaneous character, and do not realize the implications of their convictions? In both cases there is the need of cohering and systematizing principles that shall unite men and give them stability without standardizing them; failing that, there are apt to be all sorts of promiscuous combinations, 'syncretisms' devoid of root and power of growth. Here Biblical Criticism has undoubtedly a very important part to play,[22] partly because it is gradually treading upon the ground which concerns the theologian rather than the Biblical critic as such, and partly because it raises questions which come first, before a theological synthesis can be attempted.

(*f*) As a new movement progresses men forget the factors that inaugurated it and gave it driving power. Thus, as regards Old Testament criticism, there is a tendency to forget that the uniqueness of Hebrew prophecy was the clue to the theory of the priority of the reforming prophets over the priestly ritual of the Pentateuch. Men ignore or belittle the work of the prophets themselves, and fail to see the necessity of the conflict between prophet and priest in old Israel, or of St. Paul's anti-Jewish

[22] *Cf.* A. B. Davidson, *Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 5: 'Criticism or Introduction must precede any attempt at a scientific Old Testament Theology.'

stand, or of the Protestant Reformation. The subsequent adjustments and 'reassertions' of the old in the new movement even allow the impression that earlier uncompromising attitudes were uncalled for. In this way men will feel that their own conservative or traditional attitude is being justified, or that the movement will somehow arrive at or lead to the rehabilitation of their own position. Like Mephibosheth of old, they cherish the hope that the fresh unstable conditions in the newly established kingdom are going to restore to them the kingdom of Saul. And sometimes it does look like it! After all, post-exilic Judaism did contain many elements that had a pre-prophetic ancestry!

Here are typical changes in (r)evolutionary movements such as are found in ancient and modern history, in the vicissitudes of religion, and in the chequered progress of diverse lines of research. They need far more competent treatment than ever this pen could give them, for they are important for our estimate of the great problems that lie in and behind the Bible, for the history that is now being made, and for the highly technical study of mental processes of all kinds. Criticism in this way unites the study of the development of thought in the Bible with the principles of development in general, and links together Biblical studies, practical problems of religion, and new types of research in mental science. In this way it may claim to be contributing to a new stage in culture.

(10) A very brief reference to certain concrete Old Testament problems will perhaps give definiteness to what has just been said. (*a*) How shall we estimate the great reforming prophets? Were they such iconoclasts as is usually thought?[23] Opinions differ; but events in Russia have illustrated the passage from an initial revolutionary iconoclasm to subsequent adjustments and compromises. (*b*) There are always inveterate religious needs to be satisfied, and our estimate of the work of Israelite reformers will be incomplete if we ignore this. For example, local cults are so persistent, even to the present day, that it is difficult to suppose that the 'high places' ever entirely

[23] Might not the prophets have been 'social nuisances' (Burkitt, *The New Commentary*, i, 430)? Bishop Gore points out how Jesus 'refused all compromise; He was not conciliatory' (*ib.*, iii, 288); and Dr. Goudge observes, 'it is always the tendency of cautious teachers to clip the wings of St. Paul's theology, and bring back a certain amount of legalism' (*ib.*, iii, 432).

disappeared. Hence the question arises, are the local sanctuaries of JE of the age before the reformers, or — as I think — later? (*c*) Religion must be practical, and the magical or magico-religious ideas which are to be found in the post-exilic priestly religion of Jerusalem would certainly not be weaker in pre-prophetic times.[24] That is to say, from the *reformed* religion in post-exilic times we can, with due caution, consider what it was at an earlier stage prior to the reforms.

(*d*) Sacred beings must be accessible and perform their functions; hence the numerous angels of the post-exilic period can probably be best explained as the late representatives of the earlier gods.[25] (*e*) Finally, when the older religion was 'reformed,' the evidence goes to suggest that crude and 'heathenish' ideas of an existence after death were killed by ethical monotheism.[26] Fellowship with God was the *summum bonum*: it constituted a bond which was not broken by death. On this A. B. Davidson has some important remarks which deserve careful attention. The reason why ideas of immortality occur only in late sources is because there was something in the old religion which had made them unnecessary; but as men's ways of thinking changed and their former modes of thinking were modified, their spiritual needs must be satisfied afresh.[27] What we have expressed in our own words is the fact that earlier beliefs and practices which *implied* a relationship with Israel's Yahweh were broken down, and that subsequently there grew up new explicit convictions of resurrection and another life. The 'great object' of revelation, he says, 'was to enable men in each age practically to live unto God; . . . at all times it gave them light sufficient for this.' Indeed, the comparative study of religions does show how men of different ages and types of culture have beliefs and practices which evidently enable them to live out their lives; but that from time to time there come the great changes, shattering one system of life and thought and replacing it by another.

The chief problems of Biblical criticism turn upon the nature, the depth and the results of profound religious changes.

[24] See *The Old Testament: A Reinterpretation* (1936), p. 151 sq.
[25] *Op. cit.*, p. 159.
[26] *Op. cit.*, p. 134. See T. H. Sprott, *Inspiration and the Old Testament* (1909), p. 157 sq.
[27] Based on his *Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 405 sq.

New movements and reforming measures are apt to destroy the good with the bad, to set aside or ignore earlier tendencies which will subsequently come to the front again, and, in their anxiety to blaze the new track, they fail to satisfy genuine needs and aspirations. The conflicts between religion and science, the insistence of the Fundamentalist upon certain primary values which Biblical criticism seems (to him) to destroy, and the heresies of all ages — whether justified or not — are recurring processes as important for our own interpretation of the Biblical history as for our thoughts concerning the future.

(11) When we turn from the steps in the development of religion to the creative factors, we may refer, first, to the new interest in the question of Primitive Monotheism. All that need be said here is that there is abundant evidence for religious experience—*of sorts*, and for the recognition of high gods, creators, fathers, etc. But although even profound religious experience is a world-wide phenomenon, we are obliged to treat the evidence critically, and consider, as far as may be, the significance of the experience or the religious conviction for the history of the individual, tribe or people. Invariably every new religious factor works upon the existing conditions, whether we are dealing with the familiar evidence for the effects of religious conversion upon the individual or the effects of the ethical monotheism of the Second Isaiah upon the thought of his age. Whether a 'religious' experience or conviction is rightly so styled will depend upon its content and effects; and of course among very rudimentary or prehistoric tribes the content would be extremely primitive. Religious and mystical experiences differ markedly in character and in value, and, not in Palestine alone, some of them—for whatever reason—have been enormously more genetically significant than others.

There is real religious feeling in Philo, the pseudepigraphical literature, and above all in Jewish piety; but it was not the ethical monotheism of Judaism, it was a new religious enthusiasm with fresh driving power that determined the next stage in history. And if we go back to the exilic period, the religion of *Deuteronomy* is not precisely that of *Ezekiel* or of the Second Isaiah; and while *Deuteronomy* is humanistic, rationalistic and programmatic, it is the religious intensity of the Second Isaiah

that did most for the reconstruction of Israel.[28] Amos and Hosea live in times of impending or existing dangers, but they tell of Divine Righteousness and Love; the rise of Christianity was at a time of narrow nationalism, class-feeling and fanaticism, but it was the teaching of the relationship between God and Man that introduced the new historical epoch. That is why the exilic period is so exceedingly interesting: *Deuteronomy* has so many attractive features, and yet there is a mystery about a book which subsequently has to take a second place.[29] With all its idealism it is narrow, and in its antipathy to the Non-Israelite it is fanatical. This was not the spirit of the Second Isaiah, and P, too, manifests a greater tolerance. To us to-day, when a fanatical Marxism seems to its followers to hold out the only hope of a new world, certain problems of Biblical criticism should have an almost topical value; and in some oft-quoted words of Marx himself we may find a truth which he certainly could never have realized: *Die Kritik der Religion ist die Voraussetzung aller Kritik*. We accept the challenge.

(12) To conclude. Biblical criticism aims primarily at recovering, as fully as may be, the history and religion of Israel and at depicting it upon the background of universal history and religion. But in the life-histories of both individuals and peoples—as also of lines of thought—there is a difference between *Das Geschehen* and *Geschichte*. Every incident will have its own appropriate relevance; but guiding principles are necessary to help us to distinguish between tested 'facts,' which as such are 'true,' and those essential 'truths' which give meaning and continuity to all that can be treated historically. Similarly the data of religion have their own 'truth'; but we have to distinguish between the phenomenology of the subject and what we feel to be essential for the 'truth' of religion. In either case the task is no antiquarian or academic scrutiny of what happened or was believed, although this is a necessary step; we have in view the future, and seek a starting-point for a better handling of the whole field by ourselves and others. Moreover, concep-

[28] On D as a brave but unsuccessful effort to stem the decline of Israel, see Causse, Acts of the Congress of the History of Religions at Lund, p. 286 sq.

[29] *Cf.* Welch, *Deuteronomy, the Framework to the Code* (1932), pp. 66, 183 sq., 201, 209; *Post-exilic Judaism* (1935), p. 283.

tions of Biblical religion cannot rest upon the Bible alone; a much wider field is required, and, in like manner, a theology must seriously consider the extent of the environment it hopes to inform.

In addition to this, the intense religious realism of the outstanding portions of the Bible illustrates the difference between (*a*) a supernaturalism which is in contrast to the 'natural' world, and (*b*) the theism of the prophets, which may be said to place the 'supernatural' within the 'natural.' To them Yahweh was in an effective relationship with all who did His will; and if their 'realism' might appear to lay undue stress upon the Immanence of God in this world, no one felt His Transcendence more truly than did the prophets themselves. But the Hebrews were not philosophers, and Christianity, among many permanent debts to Greek thought, owes also the more ambiguous and dangerous dualism of body and spirit, against which there is to-day a certain reaction.[30] Whatever *attacks* upon Christianity from outside there may be to-day, it cannot be too earnestly taken to heart that there is a deep-reaching *criticism* within, and the recognition of the need of an entire re-thinking of its most fundamental tenets. So, Biblical Criticism, starting from very obvious and pressing enquiries, raises vital questions *which come first*, and which have priority over any premature synthesis or systematizing. The 'hurt' of the people cannot be lightly healed.

Past history tells of men who aimed at a millennium : the aim has guided their steps, but what has been reached has been another stage, or the inauguration of a new series of stages. Men have concentrated upon their goal, but what they felt to be irrelevant, secondary or superseded has later 'returned' or reasserted itself. If there has been what is called 'reaction,' the men who live in the new movement, members of a new organism, did not feel it as such. There has been progressive development because of men intuitively aware of what should come first, men who concentrated upon the next stage and not upon the stages

[30] In this connection it is worth remembering that Davidson (*op. cit.*, pp. 250, 412 sq.) thought that we may have diverged from Hebrew theism, 'not indeed in fundamental faith but practically further than was necessary.' Schweitzer (*Decay and Restoration of Civilization*, 1932, p. 68) remarks upon the retention in our religion of outgrown Greek and Oriental conceptions which are making us bleed to death.

which might follow. There are men who in all honesty cannot find a place in their minds for certain elements which do in fact reassert themselves—though in a new form—and they are fearful of the subsequent return or reassertion of that against which they or their ancestors fought. But any analysis of past creative movements will show how much detailed history has been forgotten, how many and varied are the minds that have contributed, and how readily—too readily—we telescope the past and ignore the prolonged toil and anxiety that went to the success of those movements which we can survey in fewer moments than it took years to effect.

First things come first, and Biblical Criticism tells us of (r)evolutionary movements which ultimately made Western civilization what it is. It opens up questions of Biblical history itself, of the *rationale* of progressive development—and so of progressive revelation. It brings vital questions of the processes of thought in the individual—who is the atom—and in our knowledge of the Cosmos itself; for the evolution of the Cosmos, of man, and of his consciousness of all that has gone before are parts of one and the same process. Everything turns upon problems of Divine Reality; and if first things come first, we need to rediscover for ourselves that reality of God which the prophets of the Old and New Testaments so keenly felt. And if so, forthwith men will need the conception of a *personal* approach to God; and a new synthesis of the Old Testament and the New Testament will unite both the reality of God and of the Person through whom He is approached.

To some of us it seems certain that if Christianity is to have a future, the first task is not so much to 'bring souls to Christ' as to understand Who it is to whom it is the function of the Christ to bring men. A new comprehension of the spirit of the Old Testament will give a fresh meaning to the New. And *if* we can imagine a renewal of the passion for Ethical Monotheism and the Spirit of Christ, and *if* we can imagine a new movement inaugurating a new series of stages in the history of religion, then indeed a future age, reading and reinterpreting its Bible in the light of its new religious experience, will look back and say, 'So there was a Second Coming after all.' But this is to television the future as we already telescope the past.

REVISED SERVICES

By the Editor.

NINETEEN years ago I published in the *Modern Churchman* revised Services for Infant Baptism, Marriage, and Burial. They have had a considerable use and wide circulation.* I now venture to publish three more revised services for Adult Baptism, the Churching of Women, and the Visitation of the Sick. These revised services are all based on our Prayer Book offices.

While the *Deposited Book* did good work in its revision of some of the Occasional Offices, its efforts in other cases were very inadequate. All practical modern-minded clergymen realize the great need for revised services, particularly in the case of the Occasional Offices, for there are an increasing number of English people who only attend the occasional services in our churches. It is therefore urgently needful for the extension of Christian influence that these services should not seem to these people to justify the complaint that the Church of England as a moral and spiritual teacher is hopelessly out of date.

A comparison between these revised services and our Prayer Book will indicate that the revision has had two definite aims.

(1) The elimination of statements which are inconsistent with our spiritual and moral convictions and scientific knowledge.

(2) The extension of the range of the services in response to the manifold needs of modern life.

I have tried to reproduce, although I cannot claim to have succeeded, the rhythm and harmonies of that masterpiece of devotion which has both enriched our literature and inspired our worship.

To Mr. John Kenneth Barnes and to Mr. Roderick Poole, to whom I submitted these efforts, I am grateful for useful criticism and suggestions.

* These three services (with further revisions), together with the services in this article, have been reprinted in booklet form and can be obtained from Messrs. B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., 50 Broad Street, Oxford, price 1/-.

I.

BAPTISM OF ADULTS.

All standing at the Font the Minister shall say:

Hear the words of the Gospel, written by Saint John, in the third Chapter, at the first Verse.

There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto Him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these signs that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born from above. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof; but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.

Beloved ye hear in this Gospel that there is a spiritual birth as well as a natural birth, and that this spiritual birth is needful for man's salvation. Christian Baptism is an effectual sign of this spiritual birth, whereby those who are baptized are granted forgiveness of all their sins, are admitted into Christ's holy Church, and enter on the new life as children of God.

Let us pray.

We yield Thee humble thanks, O heavenly Father, that Thou hast vouchsafed to call us to the knowledge of Thy grace, and faith in Thee: Increase this knowledge, and confirm this faith in us evermore. Give Thy Holy Spirit to *this man* that *he* turning from darkness to light and from the power of evil unto God may receive forgiveness of all *his* sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in Thee.

The Minister shall then address the candidate:

Beloved, thou art come here to receive holy Baptism. It is needful that before receiving the same thou shouldst renounce all evil, affirm the truth of the Christian faith, and promise with God's help to obey His holy will and walk in the same all the days of thy life.

Question:

Dost thou renounce all evil, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with the covetous desires of the same?

Answer: I renounce them all.

Question:

Dost thou believe in God the Father, Maker of heaven and earth?

And in Jesus Christ His only-begotten Son our Lord?

And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, and Giver of Life?

Answer: I do.

Question:

Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?

Answer: That is my desire.

Question:

Wilt thou then obediently keep God's holy will and commandment, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?

Answer: I will endeavour to do so, God being my helper.

Then shall the Minister say:

Almighty and eternal God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to Thee for succour, the life of them that believe, and the resurrection of the dead; grant to *this man* the birth which is from above; receive *him*, O Lord, as Thou hast promised by Thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask, and ye shall have; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: so give now unto us that ask; let us that seek find; open the gate unto us that knock; that *this man* may enter into that life which is life indeed, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Then the Minister, taking him by the right hand, shall baptize him with these words:

N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. *Amen.*

Then shall the Minister say:

We receive this *man* into the congregation of Christ's flock and do sign *him* with the sign of the Cross,* in token that hereafter *he* shall steadfastly confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully fight under His banner against all evil; and continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto *his* life's end. *Amen.*

Beloved, being certified by baptism that *thou art a child* of God and of the light, it is *thy* part and duty to walk answerably to *thy* Christian calling, remembering always that baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ and to be made like unto Him; that as He died and rose again for us, so should we who are baptized die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness; transforming our baser instincts into noble action and high endeavour, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living.

Let us pray.

All kneeling:

Our Father (with doxology).

We beseech Thee, O heavenly Father, to give Thy grace to *this* Thy *servant* that *he* may remain faithful to *his* promises, and grow in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, and live godly, righteously, and soberly in this present world. *Amen.*

Standing by the Font, the Minister shall dismiss the newly baptized with these words:

Go forth into the world in peace; be of good courage; hold fast that which is good; render to no man evil for evil; strengthen

* Here the Minister shall make a Cross upon the *man's* forehead.

the fainthearted; support the weak; help the afflicted; honour all men; love and serve the Lord, rejoicing in the power of the Holy Spirit. *Amen.*

At the Confirmation, which should follow as soon as may be, the Bishop shall say:

Let us pray.

O Eternal God, who art the source of all spiritual strength, sustain *this* Thy *servant*, we beseech Thee, with the Spirit of the Comforter, and daily increase in *him* Thy manifold gifts of grace: the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the spirit of knowledge and true godliness; and fill *him*, O Lord, with the spirit of Thy holy love, now and for ever. *Amen.*

[*Then shall follow the rest of the Service as in the Book of Common Prayer of* 1662.]

II.

THANKSGIVING AFTER CHILD-BIRTH.

The Woman kneeling at the Communion-rails, the Minister shall say:

Forasmuch as it hath pleased God to give you safe deliverance, and to preserve you in the great peril of Child-birth; let us give thanks unto Him, and say:

Praise the Lord, O my soul: and all that is within me praise his holy Name.

Praise the Lord, O my soul: and forget not all his benefits;

Who forgiveth all thy sin: and healeth all thine infirmities;

Who saveth thy life from destruction: and crowneth thee with mercy and loving-kindness.

The Lord is full of compassion and mercy: long-suffering, and of great goodness.

Yea, like as a father pitieth his own children : even so is the Lord merciful unto them that fear Him.

Our Father (with doxology).

O Heavenly Father, we give Thee humble thanks for that Thou hast vouchsafed to deliver this woman thy servant from the great pain and peril of Child-birth; grant, we beseech Thee, that through Thy help, she may faithfully live, and walk according to Thy will; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

O heavenly Father we most humbly thank Thee for the gift of a child to this home; grant that *his* parents, knowing *him* to be Thy child as well as theirs, may so strive to bring *him* up that *he* may increase in the knowledge of Thee and of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

And we most humbly beseech Thee to send Thy blessing upon the husband of this woman and upon her home. May the spirit of Christ dwell there. May the blessings of love and peace abide there. May happiness be its possession and Thy divine protection its strength; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Except the Lord build the house : their labour is but lost that build it.

Except the Lord keep the city : the watchman waketh but in vain.

It is but lost labour that ye haste to rise up early, and so late take rest, and eat the bread of carefulness : for he giveth to his beloved while they sleep.

Lo, children and the fruit of the womb : are an heritage and gift that cometh of the Lord.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son : and to the Holy Spirit;

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be : world without end. *Amen.*

If the Woman be accompanied by her Husband, the Minister may add:

Blessed are all they that fear the Lord : and walk in his ways.

For thou shalt eat the labours of thine hands : O well is thee, and happy shalt thou be.

Thy wife shall be as the fruitful vine: upon the walls of thine house.

Thy children like the olive-branches: round about thy table.

Lo, thus shall the man be blessed: that feareth the Lord.

The Lord from out of Sion shall so bless thee: that thou shalt see Jerusalem in prosperity all thy life long.

Yea, that thou shalt see thy children's children: and peace upon Israel.

The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace, now and for evermore. *Amen.*

III.

VISITATION OF THE SICK.

The Minister kneeling down in the sick man's room shall say:

Peace be to this house and to all that dwell in it.

Psalm 23.

The Lord is my shepherd: therefore can I lack nothing.

He shall feed me in a green pasture: and lead me forth beside the waters of comfort.

He shall convert my soul: and bring me forth in the paths of righteousness, for his Name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff comfort me.

Thou shalt prepare a table before me against them that trouble me: thou hast anointed my head with oil, and my cup shall be full.

But thy loving-kindness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

For the sick man:

O Lord, behold, visit, and relieve this Thy servant. Look upon *him* with the eyes of Thy mercy, give *him* comfort and sure confidence in Thee, and keep *him* in perpetual peace and safety; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Hear us, most merciful God and Saviour; extend Thy accustomed goodness to this Thy servant who is prostrated with sickness, that the sense of *his* weakness may add strength to *his* faith: turn *his* affliction into a blessing; give *him* grace to entrust *himself* to Thy gracious keeping, and surrender *his* will to Thine: through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

For Attendants:

O God of all wisdom and patience, grant to those who minister to the sick the gifts of insight and skill, the graces of tenderness and patience, that moved by the pure love of Thee and of mankind, they may serve in the spirit of Him who said, 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.' *Amen.*

For absent friends:

O Heavenly Father, from whom no time nor space can ever separate us, we know that those who are absent from one another are still present to Thee; we pray Thee to take into Thy gracious keeping those dear ones from whom we are now separated, and grant that as we draw nearer to Thee, so we may be drawn nearer to one another; that whether or no we meet again on earth we may yet meet at the resurrection of the just, and go together into that home of many mansions which Thou hast prepared for all them that faithfully serve Thee; in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Supplication and Thanksgiving (*from Psalm* 71).

In thee, O Lord, have I put my trust; let me never be put to confusion: but rid me, and deliver me in thy righteousness; incline thine ear unto me, and save me.

Be thou my strong hold, whereunto I may alway resort: thou hast promised to help me; for thou art my house of defence, and my castle.

For thou, O Lord God, are the thing that I long for: thou art my hope, even from my youth.

Through thee have I been holden up ever since I was born: my praise shall be always of thee.

O let my mouth be filled with thy praise: that I may sing of thy glory and honour all the day long.

My mouth shall daily speak of thy righteousness and salvation: for I know no end thereof.

For repose:

O Lord support us all day long, until the shades lengthen, and the evening comes, and the busy world is hushed, the fever of life over and our work done. Then, Lord, in Thy mercy, grant us safe lodging, holy rest, and peace at the last; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Blessing:

Unto God's gracious mercy and protection we commit thee. The Lord bless thee, and keep thee. The Lord make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace, now and for evermore. *Amen.*

ADDITIONAL PRAYERS FOR SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

For one in pain:

O loving and merciful Father, to Whom alone belong the issues of life and death; look upon this thy servant now lying upon the bed of sickness: visit *him*, O Lord, with Thy salvation, deliver *him* from *his* bodily pain: that *he* may live to Thee and be an instrument of Thy glory, by serving Thee faithfully, and doing good in *his* generation; or else receive *him* into those heavenly habitations, where the souls of the righteous are in peace and felicity: through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

For one in great weakness:

O Father of mercies, and God of all comfort, our only help in time of need; we fly unto Thee for succour on behalf of this Thy servant, here lying in great weakness of body. Look graciously upon *him*, O Lord; that the more the outward man faileth, the more the inward man may be renewed; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

For one troubled in mind:

O Blessed Lord, we beseech Thee, look in pity upon this Thine afflicted servant. Give *him* a right understanding of *himself*, and of Thee; that *he* may not cast away *his* confidence in Thee. Give *him* strength against all *his* temptations, and relieve *his* heaviness. Make *him* to hear of joy and gladness. Lift up the light of Thy countenance upon *him*, and give *him* peace: through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

For Forgiveness:

O most merciful God, Who, according to the multitude of Thy mercies, dost so put away the sins of those who truly repent, that Thou rememberest them no more; open Thine eye of mercy upon this Thy servant, who most earnestly desireth pardon and peace; renew in *him*, most loving Father, whatsoever hath been decayed by *his* own carnal will and frailness; consider *his* contrition, accept *his* prayers; and strengthen *him* with Thy blessed Spirit: through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

If the sick man be troubled in conscience and desire to make confession, the Priest shall hear the same, assuring him of the divine forgiveness if he do sincerely repent and forgive all those who have done him wrong. Should he desire the Priest to pronounce the absolution, it shall be done in the accustomed form.

Commendatory prayer.

O Eternal God, with Whom do live the spirits of just men made perfect; we humbly commend the soul of this Thy servant, our dear *brother*, unto Thee as unto a faithful Creator. Grant *him* the joy of Thy presence, and may light perpetual shine upon *him*, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

For communion of the sick:

The Collect.

O Almighty Lord, and everlasting God, vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, to direct, sanctify, and govern, both our hearts and bodies, in the ways of Thy laws, and in the works of Thy commandments; that through Thy most mighty protection, both here and ever, we may be preserved in body and soul; through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

The Epistle, Rom. 8,[18-23].

For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creation was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath made it subject, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.

The Gospel, St. John 6,[35, 37].

Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.

All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.

Or, St. John 14,[1-3].

Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.

THE CHURCH AND THE TWENTIETH CENTURY*

By the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D., F.B.A., K.C.V.O.

THIS is an important book. The contributors are ten representative Liberal Anglicans, writing quite independently of each other. They occasionally contradict each other, as good Liberals should. Secure in fundamental agreement on the main point, that thought and the expression of thought should be free, they are content to differ on points which are not always unimportant. The object of the book is practical rather than speculative; the writers advocate reforms in doctrine, liturgy, and policy.

The Bishop of Birmingham has read all the essays; his preface is excellent. He begins by claiming that Liberal Churchmen are not necessarily 'Modernists,' though they have, unfortunately as I think, accepted the name which the Pope affixed to a rather different school within the Roman Church. They are 'heirs of a tradition which can be traced through some of the greatest of Victorian divines to the Cambridge Platonists' and Erasmus. This claim is also emphasised by Dr. Cross, who traces the succession further back, through Aquinas and Augustine to Plato. This is in my opinion the central tradition in English theology, which links it more closely to the *philosophia perennis* of the Catholic philosophy than to the pronounced anti-intellectualism of much continental modernism.

I am glad that the Bishop insists that 'every religion into which the notion of the divine enters must be sacramental.' But I do not think that the corruptions of sacramentalism are so much due to the 'mystery religions,' which were not all superstitious, as to the materialisation of sacramental grace, against which the Bishop has conducted such a courageous campaign. Crude supernaturalism 'destroys the nature of a sacrament,' no less than the theory which reduces it to a mere form or commemoration.

Most of the contributors to this volume wish to rationalize

* *The Church and the Twentieth Century,* edited by G. L. H. Harvey, pp. 448. (Macmillan. 1936. 15/- net.)

and simplify dogma by the excision of 'fact-like stories,' as von Hügel calls them, which can find no place in strictly scientific history. And yet, as the Bishop says, 'those elements in the Gospels and Acts which scholars assign to the myth-making faculty, and of which we would fain be rid, were especially the elements beloved by Christians when the standard creeds were formed.' Why were these elements specially beloved, and why are they still beloved by the majority of Christians? This is a question which touches us very nearly. To us these stories, whether true or not, have little or no religious value. We should be most indignant if we were accused of believing that Christ is God as well as man because He was physically a hybrid between the two species. But this is what vast numbers of Christians say and think they believe. And yet they do not quite believe it. If they did, they would see themselves that merely physical miracles are no aid to faith. They need myths; and if we are honest with ourselves, we all need them. To the philosopher, when he tries to live out his creed, the determinations of the Absolute become quickening spirits, and the Platonic heaven 'yonder' becomes a fairyland of the imagination. The natural language of devotion is poetry, not science; it is imagination, not research, which gives substance to things hoped for, and supplies evidence of things not seen. This is the function of Plato's myths, and to a large extent of Christian dogma. Can we then agree with Dr. Binns, when he says, 'We must never acquiesce in any kind of doctrine of two truths. If a thing is true in science, it must be true also in religion'? We cannot count or weigh the contents of the world of values. Rationalism has its limitations. It is easy to say, 'If you want to talk poetically and imaginatively, do so; but do not pretend that myth is scientific truth.' It is just because, as Dr. Binns says, 'God's world is one, and cannot be divided into mutually exclusive spheres,' that this is impossible, and that the practical difficulties in preaching and teaching, for an educated man who wishes to help his flock without telling them what he does not believe himself, are enormous. Religion is not, as some now assert, irrational; but it contains elements which cannot be rationalized.

In the sphere of dogma certain tendencies can be discerned in almost all the essays. Is Christianity becoming a religion

without an eschatology? A startling question; but there is very little in this book to suggest that the four last things occupy much of the attention of the writers. That most of our simple Christians are tritheists has been often pointed out before, for example by Dean Rashdall. On the other hand, Bernard Shaw has said that the Holy Ghost is the sole survivor of the Trinity — a scoffing half-truth which must not be forgotten. The new Evangelicalism agrees with the successors of the Oxford movement in emphasizing the Incarnation far more than the Atonement. It would be hardly too much to say that the Atonement is now falling into the background of our theology.

The question of the seat of authority in religion is not raised, as it surely ought to be. Infallibility is a category which men cannot use. But the rival claims of the Church, the Bible, and the Inner Light need careful consideration. There is, however, a very valuable and conclusive exposure of the claim that the authority of the Creeds is supreme above all other. This theory, which is especially associated with the name of Bishop Gore, emerges from this discussion as neither honest nor intelligent. It is manifestly an artificial barrier, intended on the one hand to check the progress of Liberal thought in the Church, and more especially to keep the cable uncut which may at some future time make possible a reconciliation with Rome. Few things that have happened lately are more regrettable than the decision of the Northern Bishops in the Liverpool case to make the Nicene Creed normative in questions of permissible deviations from orthodoxy. It was a pitiful end to an unedifying incident. One might have supposed that if a Bishop were asked to sanction an invitation to a non-Anglican to preach, two questions would decide the response — who is the man? and on what subject is he asked to preach? There are some Free Churchmen, like Dr. Garvie, about whom no further questions need be asked. Otherwise, a sensible Bishop would probably allow a Quaker to preach on Christian mysticism, a Unitarian on the arguments for theism, and a Presbyterian on Christian ethics.

Another point bearing on authority is raised by two essayists, who contradict each other. Sir Arnold Wilson, as a Member of Parliament, says roundly that the laity 'do not accept the bench of Bishops as keepers of the national conscience, nor the clergy

as arbiters of current social questions . . . They do not question the right of the Bishops and clergy to speak on such questions; they often question their competence.' If Dr. Cross had read these very sensible words, he would perhaps have been less ready to speak of the duty of 'the Church' to 'give guidance on the great issues of contemporary life.' Who are the men who have the right, or the audacity, to declare the judgment of 'the Church' on complicated social problems, and would their pronouncements, if delivered, have any value whatever? It is high time that such language was given up altogether. Churchmen may be wise or foolish; 'the Church' has neither mind nor voice.

The suggestions for a revision of the liturgy will be approved, in general, by most Liberal Churchmen. But we must not forget that worshippers become attached to old forms because they are familiar, and seldom think of the antiquated ideas which they express. The effect of the rejection of the New Prayer Book was to introduce an era of almost complete freedom, of 'trial and error,' into the parish churches — a very happy result, in my opinion. The incumbent soon finds out what the churchgoers really like, and tries to adapt the service to their tastes. In course of time, some experiments will probably have been proved to be very suitable to certain types of worshippers.

One of the worst things done by the Church Assembly was to define an Anglican as one who belongs to the Church of England and to no other body. Apart from the absurdity of disfranchising the King, who is a Presbyterian in Scotland, this intolerant act practically drives into nonconformity a large number of 'occasional conformists' who quite justifiably like to attend church and chapel by turns. The same unfortunate temper has shown itself whenever the question of Intercommunion comes up. Nothing has done so much to retard the mutual friendliness which had began to unite the denominations before the war, and which the war, for a time, seemed likely to accelerate. The concessions offered by the Church are felt to be insulting. The real test is not whether Free Churchmen shall sometimes be admitted to Anglican communions, but whether we are willing to receive the sacrament, on exceptional occasions, from ministers not episcopally ordained. These occasions

are not very uncommon in Scotland. I agree with Canon Raven that we should act without waiting for leave to do so. 'There is,' as he says, 'something amusing in the warnings against anarchy and the fulminations against innovation which now proceed from those whose influence was established by a continuous and deliberate flouting of episcopal authority.'

Progressive Churchmanship has no static programme, and is tolerant of much difference of opinion. We must not, in my opinion, be greatly discouraged by what is happening in certain foreign countries. 'You may expel human nature with a pitchfork; she will always come back.' Religion, the family, private property — even some degree of liberty — are too deeply engrained in human nature to be destroyed by revolution. Christianity, like other institutions, will come back, with its nobility and its imperfections. It should not be too difficult to adapt its forms to new conditions — to an age of science and of general though rather superficial education. The Spirit of Christ is with us as with our fathers; He does not leave Himself without witness.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PARABLES*

Those who do not easily read German cannot but feel deeply grateful to the scholars who are helping to make the new approach to the New Testament—especially the Synoptic Gospels—more understandable; and we are especially grateful for being given a sympathetic estimate of its value and importance from the English point of view. When a recognised authority like Professor Dodd shows us the significance of the new approach, we must listen with the greatest attention to what he has to teach us. His book, *The Parables of the Kingdom,* will help us to understand and appreciate the value of post-war research in the Gospels. It is a book of real importance. It should be read along with Prof. Lightfoot's Bampton Lectures and the now accessible (in English) works of Dr. M. Dibelius. Professor Dodd is a clear writer and lucid expositor, and his impressive scholarship is not befogging but illuminating; his book is throughout positive, constructive and helpful; moreover, the point of view which he lays before us has very important consequences not only for theology but also for religion. The footnotes and documentation are suggestive and useful, and there is a practical *Verzeichnis* of Scriptural quotations as well as an index of authors at the end of the book.

Dr. Dodd begins with an acknowledgment of Adolf Jülicher's thesis

* *The Parables of the Kingdom.* By C. H. Dodd, M.A., D.D., Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. (Nisbet & Co., 1935. 7/6.)

(developed in *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu,* 1899—1910) that the parables of Jesus are not allegories, and that all attempts to treat them as such (including those of the Evangelists themselves) rest on a misunderstanding (p. 13). The parables are rather 'the natural expression of a mind that sees truth in concrete pictures rather than conceives it in abstractions' (p. 15 f.).

> 'At its simplest, the parable is a metaphor or simile drawn from nature or from common life, arresting the hearer by its vividness or strangeness, and leaving the mind in sufficient doubt about its precise application to tease it into active thought' (p. 16).

For example: 'Where the carcass is the vultures will gather'; 'Make yourselves purses that do not wear out.' Sometimes the metaphor is elaborated into a picture by the addition of detail (*e.g.* the Lamp on the Lamp-stand); again, sometimes it is elaborated into a complete short story — the parable proper (*e.g.* the Costly Pearl or the Prodigal Son). Thus, Dodd agrees with Bultmann's basis of classification (*Bildwörter, Gleichnisse* and *Parabel;* cf. *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition,* 1931, pp. 179-222). Since each parable or parabolic saying is a metaphor and not an allegory, we must look in it for only one 'point'; the details will not have (as in allegories) independent significance (p. 18 f.). But Dodd would not have us find the point of a parable in a mere broad ethical or religious commonplace, as Jülicher does (p. 24); he holds that if we look to see in the parables some bearing upon the actual and critical situation in which Jesus and his hearers stood, we shall not make the mistake of turning the point of a parable into a rather 'flattening' generalisation. For example, the point of the parable of the Talents or Pounds is not merely the ethical commonplace of 'fidelity in all that God has entrusted to us' (Jülicher).

> 'The task of the interpreter of the parables (says Dodd) is to find out, if he can, the setting of a parable in the situation contemplated by the Gospels, and hence the application which would suggest itself to one who stood in that situation' (p. 26).

This is the principal aim of Professor Dodd's book. We are grateful to him for thus succinctly stating the real problem of the parables, for it seems clear to us that this is the interpreter's main task; doubtless, different readers will hold different opinions about the measure of Dodd's success in solving the problem which he states; but at least to ask the right question is the first step toward discovering the right answer.

Professor Dodd reasonably argues that the parables about the Kingdom must be interpreted in the light of the rest of Jesus' (non-parabolic) teaching on the subject. Our view of what Jesus meant by the Kingdom will determine our interpretation of the parables, and so Dodd discusses the matter at some length. Chapter II forms perhaps the best essay in the English language on the idea of the Kingdom of God as we find it in the Synoptists. Later in the book Dr. Dodd summarizes the conclusions reached in this essay:

> 'The view taken in this book is that in the few explicit (non-parabolic) statements which Jesus made about the coming of the Kingdom, it is neither an evolutionary process nor a catastrophic event in the near future, but a present crisis. It is not that the Kingdom of God will shortly come, but that it is a present fact; and not a present fact in the sense that it is a tendency towards righteousness always present in the world, but in the sense that something has now happened which never happened before' (p. 178).

Thus, Dodd embraces neither the old liberal conception of the Kingdom nor the eschatological conception (Schweitzer), but the conception of the Kingdom as a present crisis, which has gained widespread acceptance among contemporary scholars, especially in Germany. As we have already suggested, the ordinary student of the Gospels will welcome Dodd's book because it represents the viewpoint of one of the most able and scholarly English critics who has carefully worked over the findings of the German *Formgeschichte* school and given us a balanced and characteristically English appraisement of its methods and conclusions.

In the light of this conception of the Kingdom of God, Dr. Dodd proceeds to an examination of the various parables about the Kingdom. With the Germans he differentiates between the earlier and later strands of the tradition by which they have come down to us in the Synoptic Gospels. The later tradition has a tendency to relate the parables to the circumstances of the early church of a generation or so after the crucifixion of Jesus. There is a tendency to find the meaning of the parable not in the situation as it was in the days of Jesus, but as it was when the church had settled down to its task of working out its mission and message. This is obviously true of the parables to which the evangelists have appended allegorical interpretations (the Sower, the Tares and the Drag-net), for the interpretations clearly refer to the situation within the early church rather than to the situation with which Jesus dealt. But in other parables the interpretation of the early church almost equally obviously coloured the form in which the story has come down to us. It is on this account that the modern critical task is to attempt to recover the original meaning of the parable by ascertaining its 'setting in life' (*Sitz im Leben*) — that is, the 'setting' of the actual conditions of the ministry of Jesus. The meaning of certain of the parables seems fairly clear if interpreted by the 'setting' of the actual situation of Jesus' own time. For example, the original 'point' of the parables of the Hid Treasure and Costly Pearl will be something like this: since Jesus saw in His own ministry the coming of the Kingdom of God, He simply says to men: 'You agree that the Kingdom of God is the highest good: it is within your power to possess it here and now, if, like the treasure-seeker and the pearl-merchant, you will throw discretion to the winds and follow me' (p. 113). Thus also, if we keep in mind the actual situation during the ministry of Jesus, 'the Matthaean parable of the Two Sons (Mt. xxi, 28-32) is clearly a comment on the rejection of the word of God by the religious leaders, and its acceptance by the outcasts' (p. 120). A similar situation is reflected in the parable of the Great Feast (Mt. xxii, 1-13, and Lk. xiv, 16-24). But in the elaboration of the story by the two evangelists we may detect the interests of the church at a later date. Luke sends the messengers out beyond the city into the highways and hedges: he is doubtless thinking of the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles; Matthew adds the episode of the man without a wedding-garment: he wishes to guard against the acceptance of the Gentiles into the church on too easy terms (pp. 121 f.).

Certain parables reflect the insistence of Jesus upon personal decision, now that the Kingdom has arrived and the judgment begun. Neutrality is impossible: it is 'for Him' or 'against Him'; the disciple, his decision made, must not waver as the ploughman must not look back. Faced with this crisis of decision, quick action must be taken before it is too late—like that of the Unjust Steward or that of a man being hauled before a magistrate on a charge of debt. The opportunity for decision will quickly pass away: it is even now the eleventh hour, and there is no excuse for standing

idle in the market-place. There are a certain number of 'eschatological parables' in the Gospels (*e.g.* the Faithful and Unfaithful Servants, the Waiting Servants, the Thief at Night and the Ten Virgins), but the eschatological reference belongs to the later tradition rather than to the utterance of Jesus. If we place them within His actual life-situation, they were probably originally intended to enforce His teaching that the Kingdom of God is present, and that by their conduct in the presence of this crisis men would judge themselves as faithful or unfaithful, wise or foolish. Dodd accordingly styles this group 'parables of crisis.' The church of a generation later adapted these parables 'to enforce its appeal to men to prepare for the second and final world-crisis which it believed to be approaching' (p. 174).

Another group of parables, the 'parables of growth' (the Sower, the Tares, the Seed Growing Secretly and the Mustard Seed), must be interpreted along similar lines. The later tradition tended to refer these parables to the Second Advent and to the period of church-activity which must precede it (*cf.* the interpretation which Matthew supplies to the Tares and Mark supplies to the Sower). But all such interpretation — from Mark to Schweitzer — is far from the intention of Jesus Himself. In the original telling of the stories the disciples are not sowers but reapers, for the harvest is great while the labourers are lacking (*cf.* Mt. ix, 37 f.; Lk. x, 2) (pp. 179 ff.). The harvest has indeed been prepared by a long series of 'prophets until John': after the work of the Baptist, it is time to put in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe. The point of the parables of growth was originally only a variant way of illustrating the central message: 'The time is fulfilled: the Kingdom of God has come.'

In a short concluding chapter Professor Dodd discusses the various implications and consequences of his view that we should not look for a general interpretation of the parables but should rather regard them as comments upon a particular historical situation. Their religious value is not lost by ruling out their general interpretation. It is the way in which Jesus saw the eternal order present in the immediate situation that leads us to the Christian view of history and valuation of the historical process. Christian thought can never escape the tension between 'this-worldliness' and 'other-worldliness' which is involved in the apparent contradiction between the prayer 'Thy Kingdom come' and the declaration 'The Kingdom of God has come upon you' (p. 207).

It will be apparent to all who are interested in the message of Jesus and its significance for our own days that they cannot afford to miss this book.

ALAN RICHARDSON.

THE WORLD AND GOD*

Professor Farmer writes this book in order to meet the difficulty which he believes besets many people in the modern world in thinking of God as personal. He traces this inhibition largely to the influence of monistic philosophies of the Hegelian or Spinozistic types, in which religion appears as the feeling of the individual of himself as part of the order of the whole. That there is considerable truth in this diagnosis the present reviewer can testify from her own experience, such as it is, and Prof. Farmer's book and the books of his master, Dr. Oman, are among the most convincing and persuasive attempts she knows to express the conceptions of the super-

* *The World and God.* A Study of Christian Experience in Prayer, Providence and Miracle. By H. H. Farmer. (Library of Constructional Theology. Nisbet. 1935. Price 10/6.)

natural and of God as personal in such a way as to overcome this inhibition. We may, however, ask whether Prof. Farmer does not go rather too far in describing all impersonal religion as 'naturalistic.' 'Naturalism' is usually taken to refer to such philosophies as interpret moral and religious experience in the categories of satisfaction of desire, instinct or biological evolution. Should, for instance, an ethic such as that of Nicolai Hartmann, which sets the absolute obligation to express and embody goodness beyond all considerations of satisfaction of desire, rightly be described as 'naturalistic'? The real crux appears rather to be whether we should state the ultimate demand in terms of absolute value, an 'ought to be,' or in terms of personal holy will. Prof. Farmer strengthens the religious contention that it is the latter, through his very interesting description of a personal relationship as a polarity of wills mediated to each other through the impersonal order of the world. The religious experience is one of 'ultimate demand' and 'final succour.' A mere 'ought to be' does not give the sustaining power to fulfil itself.

The main body of the book is a discussion of the interpretation of Prayer, Providence and Miracle in the light of the guiding faith that the impersonal order of the world should serve the ultimate order of personal relationships, a penetrating discussion in which Prof. Farmer sees and faces many of the very real difficulties. At one point, however, he perhaps simplifies his problem by coming very near to the purely phenomenalist view of science. He quotes Hume with approval, as having shown 'once for all' that an observed regularity is merely an observed regularity, from which we have no right to infer necessary connection and claim that the causal relations discerned by the scientist tell us anything of the real order of things. Philosophers may still be contending over their answers to Hume, but few (except the Logical Positivists) would be prepared to go so far as to say that Hume had established a 'regularity' view of causation 'once and for all.' It is interesting to observe in contrast that the Dean of St. Paul's, in his recent book, *The Purpose of God,* follows Meyerson in seeing within limits an element of explanation in causation, *i.e.* science would thus be not merely correlations of appearances, but a discovery of formal relationships (surely inadequately described by Prof. Farmer as 'mere mathematical truisms') which are a part (though it may be only a minor part) of the 'real internal constitution' of things. To deny this is surely to trivialize science.

To a Whiteheadian it is gratifying to find that Prof. Farmer tentatively favours an interpretation of the world as a monadology in which God as supreme Monad acts in *rapport* with the relatively independent creatures which are the ultimate entities of nature. We also welcome the point which he makes, following Karl Heim (in *Glaube und Denken,* now translated as *God Transcendent*), that the sense of absolute demand and final succour comes to us not in the 'spatialized' mode of an object contemplated but in the actual immediacy of concrete decision, *i.e.* such an assurance can only come as we commit ourselves in life and action, and not simply as the conclusion of theoretical enquiry.

But we are less happy to find that he also follows Heim in speaking of the relation of the temporal process to the eternal as one of 'dimensions.' We can only express these relations by means of analogy, and the analogy of dimensions may be less crude than our ordinary metaphors of 'beyond,' 'outside' and the like. But Heim and some of his English interpreters use the term as though it were more than an analogy, and almost an explanation. After all, 'dimension' is a term applicable to measurement,

when we want to describe the co-ordinates needed to locate a point. Can it be properly applied to things qualitatively different? We have here a μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος. God might conceivably be *in* a dimension (though we doubt it)—can He *be* a dimension? We mention this point because use of the word 'dimension' seems to be a growing fashion in theological books, and it needs watching. But it is a lesser point. The main impression left by Prof. Farmer's book is that it is exactly the sort of approach to the conception of God as personal which puts the basic Christian insights into a form in which contemporary philosophy must reckon with them.

DOROTHY M. EMMET.

THE CALL OF ISRAEL*

The sub-title of this volume sufficiently indicates its scope, for although Canon Pythian-Adams keeps step with the most modern Higher Critics, and outdistances many of them in the radicalism of his analysis, his purpose is throughout religious. He would

> 'recover, in however small a degree, some conception of the reality of those great Events of the Past, in which the Chosen People discerned, and responded to, the Call of God [to win] for ourselves at the least a wider prospect of faith, a clearer view of the methods of that Eternal Craftsman who worketh all things after the counsel of His Will' (p. 5).

Part I is accordingly devoted to an examination of 'the Faith' of 'the Psalmists,' 'the Prophets' and 'the Fathers' (*i.e.* the pre-prophetic worthies) respectively, and it is pointed out how they all, without exception, go back to the Exodus and its miraculous accompaniments as the mainspring of Israel's Faith and the origin of its Call. It may never have occurred to some, haunted as Canon Phythian-Adams suggests by the Demon of Familiarity, how odd it is that 'a series of purely historical events, however memorable and thankworthy, is ranked without a trace of hesitancy by the side of the great celestial wonders of Creation,' particularly when these events themselves 'are none of them those of the great days of David or Soloman, but emerge from the mists of an almost legendary age' (p. 12). Yet such is in fact the case in Psalm after Psalm, *e.g.* Ps. cxxxvi:

> 'To Him that by understanding made the heavens . . .
> To Him that spread forth the earth above the waters . . .
> To Him that made great lights . . .
> The sun to rule the day . . .
> The moon and stars to rule by night . . .
> To Him that smote Egypt in their first-born . . .
> And brought out Israel from among them . . .
> With a strong hand, and with a stretched-out arm.'

And there are many parallels (*cp.* Pss. xcv, 1-9; cxxxv, 6-12). Here, then, is 'something abnormal, something we might even call a prodigy' (p. 18). Yet the uniqueness of it all cannot be explained as due rather to the impact of the teaching of the prophets than to any very firm belief in the events of so remote a past, for the voices of the prophets themselves 'swell and unite into one single and heart-stirring cry "*Remember*"' (p. 24). Then the

* *The Call of Israel: An Introduction to the Study of Divine Election.* By W. J. Phythian-Adams, D.D., D.S.O., M.C. (O.U.P., Humphrey Milford. 1934. 8/6 net.)

problem, 'so far from being solved,' is merely shifted backwards into a still earlier age . . . it becomes necessary, in short, to assume the existence of a strong and living Tradition faithfully preserved through the centuries and constantly expounded by the religious teachers of the nation' (p. 41). So the origin of the Tradition is pushed back beyond the Solomanic temple, beyond the recovery of the Ark by David, beyond the Sanctuary at Shiloh, even beyond the Song of Deborah, for this—'one of the oldest documents in the Old Testament'—assumes that the nation was already serving Jehovah as a united whole before entering the Land of Promise. 'It is in fact the Faith of Israel itself which is seen here advancing upon Canaan from the wilderness' (p. 42), and the question still returns: *What brought that Faith originally into being?* Our author suggests three factors: (i) the bare events themselves, (ii) the intellectual genius which could invest them with supernatural significance, and (iii) the ability and willingness of the people at large to accept this significance as unquestionably true. The place of the intellectual genius is filled 'with entire adequacy' by Moses, but the people, Canon Phythian-Adams thinks, were even less able and less willing to receive his message than the Biblical record would lead us to suppose. Then Moses' first book was not to convince Pharaoh but *to convert his own people*; and traces of this conversion may be perceived in Ezek. xx, 5-8, or in Exod. iv, 1. But the efforts of Moses alone are not sufficient to account for the conversion, either of a people of every and no religious belief to the Jahweh worship, or of an 'inchoate multitude of slaves' into a 'compact self-conscious Nation, fighting with ruthless ferocity the War of Jahweh'; recourse must be had to the events themselves, as recorded in the Tradition.

So Part II examines the Tradition which is conceived as 'an immaterial Reality, not an historical treatise: it is a living Memory which inspired the Faith of Israel, not that shadow of it which survives in the Books of Exodus and Numbers' (p. 57). And as a critic Canon Phythian-Adams is superb. He confesses to approaching 'the details' of the Tradition 'with a profound scepticism' (p. 62) because of (i) 'the obvious fact that [the] documents were not composed at all till many centuries after the events they describe' and (ii) 'the strong aetiological tendency which pervades the whole historical literature of the ancient world.' The accounts which survive in Holy Scripture 'are in no sense the tradition itself: very frequently they are not even embellishments of it: they are sacred stories designed for specific purposes' (p. 63). But if this conclusion seems at first sight to preclude all hope of arriving at the facts, in reality it carries us towards them, for the facts are *there,* 'but we shall not discover them until we have penetrated *behind* the immediate purpose of the individual writer and the garb in which he has clothed it' (p. 64). Two examples are given of critical analysis (the Episodes of the Water-Miracle and of Jethro's visit) 'to reveal the inherent weakness of the "scissors and paste method," which seeks to piece together the largest possible "historical" picture out of the greatest possible number of the earliest possible documentary fragments, while completely ignoring their 'aetiological significance' (p. 78); and the whole of the details of the Tradition are explained as originating in the period Samuel-Solomon, when the Ark was captured by the Philistines and then after various vicissitudes was finally lodged in the First Temple (pp. 80-134).

The author has now stripped off 'the garb' in which 'the facts behind' have been clothed and proceeds in Part III to examine these and to account for them by physical phenomena. The Drying-up of the Jordan was due to

a blockage by a landslide, the Fall of the Walls of Jericho to a seismic disturbance, the Pillars of Cloud and Fire to an eruption of the volcanic Mount of God in Midian, and the Tables of Stone were ejected by the Mount itself, bearing 'on their surface the appearance of an unearthly script' (p. 149). It is conjectured 'that the whole of this region was at that period undergoing not one but a series of convulsions' (p. 151), and it is conjectured further that the same hypothesis will explain the Plagues and Deliverance at the Red Sea, for the geological fault which comprises the great rift of the Jordan valley, Dead Sea, Arabah and Gulf of Akabah 'is found on closer inspection to be no more than the smallest fraction of a far vaster fault which penetrates into the heart of Africa' (p. 158). So the reddening of the Nile is ascribed to an evacuation of mud during a volcanic eruption at its source, and the 'stinking' of the water and the death of the fish to the poisonous character of the mud. The Plague of Darkness was caused by the cloud of ash, which sometimes floats like a fog for thousands of miles, and the Deliverance is attributed to 'the explosion of some volcanic island or subterranean crater in the Red Sea' (p. 168). We are thus in the presence of 'one of the earth's mightiest upheavals' (p. 171), which forced the Chosen People to 'the supernatural explanation' which they have handed down to us. And in all this Canon Phythian-Adams traces the finger of God. He admits that we can refuse to go beyond 'this bald review of mundane events' (p. 174), since 'it is an undeniable fact . . . that while there are some souls who seem to have a natural gift of spiritual perception, there are numberless others to whom the attitude of faith is unintelligible' (p. 175). Yet Israel had that gift — to divine the Purpose of God. 'Its triumphant deliverance from Egypt; the solemn Covenant of Election sealed in the flames and thunders of the Mount of God — there for all later generations of Israelites were at once the charter of the Nation's destiny and the sanctions of its Faith' (p. 183).

The book concludes with two Appendixes (*sic*) on 'The Arabah and Kadesh-Barnea' and 'The Boundaries and Topography of Midian.'

Stimulated, as we must be, by the author's vigorous writing, we cannot but venture one small criticism concerning his 'rationalisation' of the miracles, which would seem to be open to objection on two grounds. (i) He has only explained *two* of the plagues by his theory of volcanic eruption, but what of the remaining *eight?* (ii) Though of course on a different plane, it smacks far too much of Elijah and his naphtha, or Venturini and his 'portable medicine-chest' for the miracles of the New Testament, to be really convincing. We may accept a volcano in Midian, perhaps, but it is surely better to call in 'the aetiological tendency' working in the Tradition to explain the Plagues or the Burning Bush than to account for two of the Plagues by an additional volcano in Abyssinia and the Burning of the Bush as an electrical phenomenon that frequently accompanies a volcanic disturbance. We must be careful not to push the explanation of Miracle by physical phenomena too far.

But apart from this detail, Modernists especially should feel grateful to Canon Phythian-Adams both for bringing out the progressive nature of Criticism, and for emphasizing the religious value of these ancient records.

It is often popularly assumed to-day that the study of the Old Testament is at a standstill, and that all we have to do is to absorb from a textbook the neatly tabulated 'assured results of criticism,' unconscious alike of the new knowledge that has only recently come to light and the very obvious consideration that the maxim, 'Time makes ancient good uncouth,' is as equally applicable to many of the conclusions of nineteenth century

Biblical critics as it is to the Fundamentalism of the earlier exegetes. Against such an attitude *The Call of Israel* is an emphatic protest, for the criticism is refreshingly free from the restraint of 'Critical Orthodoxy.' Not only is the 1220 date of the Exodus rejected (as indeed it must be), but also Prof. Burney's 'reconstruction,' in favour of a date *c.* 1440 (p. 47). It is further encouraging to read a convincing refutation of the Midianite origin of the Jahweh religion (p. 72), a refutation which is confirmed independently by the Ras Shamra tablets.

Yet Canon Phythian-Adams' contribution is especially important from the point of view of religion. It is unfortunately becoming more and more the fashion to regard the Old Testament as a collection of documents interesting indeed to the anthropologist, in so far as it shows a religion in varying stages of development, interesting probably to Christians, in so far as it records the development of that very religion which brought their own Faith to the birth. But with the exception of portions of the Prophets, little else is thought of as of spiritual value, or as suitable for teaching or reading in public worship. Against such a tendency this book is in effect, though not explicitly, a dynamic appeal. 'Christianity,' says the author, 'is not only itself an historical religion like Judaism, depending for its sanctions upon a belief in certain concrete Redemptive Acts of God: it is, in literal fact, the second chapter of that same divinely written story; the triumphant sequel in which the tragedy of the Old Covenant is transfigured in the glory of the New' (p. 4).

H. F. D. Sparks.

THE JOB OF THE SCHOOL CHAPLAIN*

This book contains much truth and some falsehood; much that is provocative of thought and not a little that is merely provoking. Of the two authors, Mr. Baring, according to the publisher's wrapper, has been in the past an assistant master at St. Paul's School, and chaplain of Newton College, Newton Abbott; Mr. Ince is at present chaplain of one of the Woodard schools, Ardingly College. Their book, according to the same source, is

> 'primarily intended for parents, headmasters, school chaplains, and parish priests, and although written from a definitely Catholic standpoint, endeavours to accord fair recognition towards any other types of religious thought which may have rendered some positive contribution towards the cause of Christianity . . . The writers are frankly critical of many factors which seem to them at variance with the highest Christian ideals; at the same time, they have put forward constructive proposals which, in their opinion, would place Public School religion upon a much firmer foundation than that which it appears to occupy at the present day . . .'

But it is only fair to that much-discussed and much-maligned article, Public School religion, to add that the authors' experiences of it do not always seem to have been of the happiest.

Why do the young grow up into any particular character? Different people would give different reasons, involving different proportions of the influences of heredity and environment. We who are concerned with their religious education know that we want to lead them to God. We do not

* *The Catholic Faith in Public Schools.* By the Rev. F. G. Baring and the Rev. G. J. Ince. With a preface by the Rev. Hubert S. Box, B.D., D.Phil., and a foreword by the Bishop of Bradford. (Williams and Norgate Ltd. 1936. 4/6.)

always know the best way to attain that. Influencing the young is under something of a cloud in modern educational theory; it is said that merely to allow them to develop will produce the better character. Yet guidance is still needed. It is true that the old repressive type of education is more calculated to fill the hearts of the young with the fear than with the love of God. But the experience of the past must count for much, too. We commonly mistrust dogma. But if dogma is, as its derivation suggests, what has seemed good, some dogma in religious education is going to be essential. A baby knows, without thought or guidance, that it must eat and drink to satisfy its bodily needs, but it needs guidance in the choice of food. The religious needs of the young ought to be as natural as eating and drinking; but, if this analogy holds good, they will need the guidance of the old in finding the ways in which they are to satisfy those needs. Here we must part company with the analogy. The highest forms of religious activity involve the active use of the human intellect. Many people, old as well as young, find active thinking very difficult; some find it impossible. Yet, unless belief in God is to vanish into a vague belief in some sort of a something somewhere (as one good woman once expressed her belief in the fundamentals of human existence), many people will have to be told what to believe. Let us then start with dogmas, but never be afraid to examine them.

So far, then, we find ourselves in agreement, in their fundamental argument, with the authors of this book. In practical details there is room for much difference of opinion. In the chapter discussing the type of man who should be appointed to a school chaplaincy, the authors suggest that there is, or rather should be, no room for the moderate-minded man; an extremist, at either end of the scale according to the school, should be appointed. It is true that virtue is not always a mean between two extremes; but there is a mean that is golden. It is quite impossible to tie a school down, so that it is either Evangelical or Anglo-Catholic. The homes of the boys themselves, in so far as they care anything at all for Christianity, will represent an infinite series of gradations between those two termini (if indeed either can be called a terminus). Doctrinal issues are not so important as they are here made out to be, nor are most boys thinking about doctrinal issues at all. Even if it is true that there are, for example, two distinct Eucharistic doctrines in the Church of England, it is possible for any given service, especially in a school chapel, to provide for both; a Catholic doctrine in the mind of one worshipper need not exclude Calvinistic ideas in the mind of another. If neither are excluded from membership of the Church of England, least of all should either be excluded from that altar which is a point of union, not of disruption. To say that

> 'a central type of religious thought stands condemned as self-contradictory and ridiculous'

and that a moderate churchmanship implies a moderate Christianity is sheer abuse and suggests lack of better argument.

A chapter on 'The Chaplain in Relation to Others,' like most of the rest of the book, bears obvious marks of personal experience. Many will be able to parallel the authors' stories illustrating the necessity of not bowing to worldly standards, even in the Common Room; I myself have heard some scandal caused by the remark of a fellow-priest, a keen cricketer, but a godly man, about to go to the vestry to robe for a service, and saying to a colleague who lacked a sense of humour, 'Well, I suppose I must go and put my pads on.'

A chapter is devoted to Conversion, and the necessity of it. The authors state that the chapter 'has considerably exceeded the length originally intended for it.' They need not have regretted the expansion.

A more controversial chapter is that on the sacrament of penance. They advocate auricular confession, while admitting the general prejudice against it. I think that they underestimate the prejudice. While confession may be of real benefit to some few boys, it is possible that a small individual gain may have to be balanced against a tremendous loss, in disunion, distrust and ill-feeling, if confession is heard, at any rate in any other school than those deliberately founded with a view to propagating Anglo-Catholic principles. Even granted that confession may be of use to some boys, it must be very hard for a chaplain, who deals with the same boy in many other spheres, to hear it.

There is, of necessity, a chapter on Confirmation, with some short discussion on that perennial theme, the right age for Confirmation, a controversy which would be possibly better left in suspense, at any rate for a time, since no argument seems to have made any difference at all. But I should take strong exception to a hypothetical case quoted on p. 57, of a boy who has come forward for Confirmation, but whose parents are assumed to be completely careless about their religious obligations. The authors say that there is little chance of such a boy becoming a real Christian : he should not be confirmed. But surely Confirmation, if it means anything at all, means the assumption of adult responsibility by the boy for his own religious life, and if he comes forward of his own free will, not automatically at a certain age, and under no pressure from anyone, we must suppose that he is going to take upon himself his baptismal vows. And in point of fact boys do so, more often than not. I recently came by one especially interesting case; a boy who had never attended a church service with his parents, who called themselves Church of England : he had never been baptised ; he presented himself for Confirmation knowing that he was unbaptised, and with the pathetic, if muddled, request that he might be allowed to attend the classes only ; he supposed, he said, that as he had not been baptised he would not be able to be confirmed. The boy is now a regular communicant, holidays included ; during the holidays he goes by himself.

Some remarks on the sort of sermons which are best listened to in a school chapel are sound. The best school sermons are those in which people come and tell us what they are doing in other spheres of Christian endeavour. First-hand accounts, even simple narratives, of experiences in the mission field are always listened to with respect. Of course, the preacher will sometimes be saved by a sense of humour, and by a little imagination of himself at the same age as his hearers, from making the wrong type of remark. It is unfortunate that some men seem to forget so readily their own youthful habits of impatience, inability to concentrate, and facility in seizing upon the wrong point. But a genuine and sincere message is always well received.

Two chapters (12 and 13) are devoted to the teaching of Divinity. Here again we have some shrewd remarks, coupled with some that are obviously based upon experience of the authors' boyhood, and which neglect progress made since then. They favour the teaching of the Scriptures by experts only, regardless of the fossilization that is liable to creep in if this is insisted on. The Bible is everybody's business. Every form-master ought to be able to teach it. The ideal would be that all teachers of the subject should take as much trouble over it as they do over other lessons. Some do so. There

is a reference on p. 107 to the supposed Public School custom of devoting the greater part of the time to the Old Testament, an allegation which may have been true twenty years ago but is certainly untrue to-day; and some unfair criticism of the Oxford and Cambridge (Joint Board) School Certificate syllabus. It is ignored that, for the past seven or eight years, instead of Old Testament history on the old-fashioned Kings-of-Israel-and-Judah lines, it has been possible to study a period of prophetic history, and doctrine. The history of Old Testament prophecy has been divided, for this purpose, into four periods, set in successive years beginning with the Divided Monarchy and ending with the Return from Exile.

The chapter on Reservation is pure Catholic doctrine of an extreme sort, though well summarised. It will have little appeal.

There is a concluding chapter on religion after leaving school, with some sound suggestions. The idea of commending boys who are leaving to individual parish priests is theoretically good, but the writers admit that it generally breaks down in practice, because the recipients of the letters so often fail to answer them, which is disheartening, to say the least of it, to those who have written them probably at considerable personal trouble. Sentences from the conclusion of the book are worth quoting:

> 'Parents often fail to realise that, in choosing a school for their sons, they are largely influencing their children's subsequent attitude towards religion. As long as parents select schools solely from secular considerations, they must be prepared for disappointment in their sons' spiritual development.'

And that seems to put the problem in a nutshell.

A foreword and a preface by the Bishop of Bradford and Dr. Box respectively add weight to the argument. (In passing, what really is the difference between a foreword and a preface?) But at times one suspects that they, too, are thinking of the Public School of their own boyhood, rather than that of the present day.

The whole book bears the obvious marks of personal experience, and of having been written in order to help others by that experience. The argument from experience can only be criticized from the point of view of other experience, and if that differs, then the discussion can be none the less fruitful. The book is indeed one (as Dr. Box says at the end of his preface) which should be read.

> 'not only by every headmaster and school chaplain, but also by all parents who have the spiritual welfare of their sons at heart.'

W. H. OLDAKER.

PSYCHOTHERAPY AND FAITH-HEALING*

It is rather disturbing to find in this really excellent little book on Religion and Psychotherapy a chapter devoted to Spiritual Healing. There seems to be something of a boom in Faith-Healing just now. Every week we hear of yet another church that has begun 'Faith-healing Services' and anointing with oil.

But it is not only that the professionally religious are becoming interested in psychical disorders. From the other side, the more thoughtful among the psychotherapists are coming to see that they cannot leave religion out of account. They have found that not only is a man's liability to

* *Religion and Psychotherapy.* A. Graham Ikin. (S.C.M. Press. 1935. 3/6.)

neurotic disorder affected by his religious beliefs, but also, when it comes to healing the sick, it often happens that the vitally important thing is the patient's outlook on life. Where this is narrow or distorted, it may well be found that it is a failure in mental adjustment that lies behind the physical symptoms, making the patient unconsciously cling to them, and preventing or hindering his restoration to health. In order to cure him it may be necessary first to teach him how to live. The seeds of disorder are scattered thickly everywhere: whether they take root or not depends upon their finding the right soil. Every failure in achievement, every difficulty, every danger we meet brings with it two possibilities: either to overcome it, to profit by it, to learn from it, to make it the means to a new and more truthful adjustment to life; or on the other hand to escape the effort which this involves by a retreat into unreality, an elaboration of fictions. It is just such a loss of contact with reality, a failure to learn and to grow, that is the essential feature of neurotic disorder. And of course neurotic disorder may express itself in physical symptoms as well as mental: in either case it is what may properly be called the spiritual failure that is the root of the trouble. All this makes it the more worth while to examine some of the dangers which seem to beset any general use of faith-healing.

Miss Ikin's book does not quite meet these points. There is much in it that is excellent, perhaps because, unlike most books on religion and psychology, it is written by one who is primarily a psychologist. The chapter on faith-healing seems to stand rather apart from the rest of the book, which is concerned with building up a very effective view of mental and bodily health as being an integration of levels of activity under the supreme control of a spiritual centre in undistorted contact with reality. Disease is to be considered as a breaking away of certain forces from this higher-level control — as a sort of rebellion, in fact. Normality is to be re-established by bringing the rebellious forces once again under control, and a great help towards this is the existence of an energetic faith in the supremacy of the forces which make for life, and a consequent devotion of the self to altruistic and worth-while ends. Where a false view of the self hinders the re-establishment of harmony, the individual must first be brought to see things as they really are, and the distorting false beliefs must be exposed. This necessary process of looking oneself frankly in the face, as it were, is a painful business. It is apt to leave one feeling very much at a loss in a very strange world. Here again a positive, an accepting, a welcoming outlook upon the world is of immense help. It is repeatedly found in psychotherapy that it is not enough to probe a patient's mind, to strip off all his illusions and leave him naked to the world to sink or swim. It may be necessary to do this before a true adjustment is possible, but it is also necessary to help the patient to make the adjustment. Someone has to undertake the business of helping him to start again on a better footing. Very often the analyst himself does this work, but it is quite a different work, and he may not be fitted to do it; it may also be impossible to continue the sittings so long as would be necessary if the doctor were to be the teacher as well. There is no doubt that a sensible parson could do valuable work here, either in calling out and applying the faith which the sufferer already has or, where the faith he has is defective, in helping him to a better. In America there exist what are called 'Life Adjustments Clinics.' Somewhat similarly, Miss Iken suggests that a sort of consulting service should be set up in this country

> 'to which psychotherapists, educationists and clergy might bring their problems, where their spheres of service overlap.'

It is a little difficult to see how such an organization, excellent in theory, could be made of practical use. It would have to be as cheap and as generally accessible as the ordinary hospital service. Another suggestion thrown out is that the Church should provide a consulting service for the use of doctors who might feel that their work needed backing up by the sort of help that specially trained clergymen could give. But once more one cannot help asking how it would be possible to provide a large enough body of clergy, freed from the pressure of other work, to make their services generally available. It would seem to be more hopeful to demand that in the training of ordinands enough attention be given to the psychology of mental illness and healing to enable them to co-operate intelligently with their local doctor. It is perhaps neither practicable nor wise to demand more.

This sort of knowledge on the part of the clergy and this sort of co-operation would undoubtedly be of great value. But this is not faith-healing. There is all the difference in the world between building up a faith that will assist the work of the doctor, and using faith as an alternative to his work. It is all to the good that clergymen should realise that they have a part to play in curing disease, and that medical men should recognize the value of that help. To assist in any way the growth of mutual understanding between the two professions, to press for a further exploration of mental and spiritual factors in the causation and cure of disease, is a work which will bear good fruit. But to mix up faith-healing with such a plea is confusing quackery with science. It is likely to alienate the medical profession and make the clergy ridiculous.

R. J. STANFORD.

CORRESPONDENCE

JESUIT *versus* BENEDICTINE.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

I do not wish to prolong this correspondence, but one remark in Mr. Hardwick's last letter raises a question of fact apart from its disagreeable insinuation that I was personally wanting in straightforwardness. His words are : ' There is much virtue in Fr. Thurston's plural "critics." . . . The insidious plural "critics" suggests that the late Abbot had a number of critics.'

I do not think that anything I wrote implied the existence of a great number of critics, though even Mr. Hardwick can hardly deny that a good many people may have disapproved of the Abbot's teaching without going to the length of expressing their views in print. Let me note, however, that the periodical *Blackfriars* is the organ of the English Dominicans, an Order which surely may claim to be heard when any question arises of theological or mystical traditions. If Mr. Hardwick will read the very outspoken article, entitled 'Abbot Chapman's Theory of Contemplation,' by Father Benet O'Driscoll, O.P., in the number of *Blackfriars* for March, 1936, he will, I think, find reason to conclude that it is not only Jesuits who have disagreed with the position taken up by Abbot Chapman in dealing with this matter of prayer.

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

REPLY TO FR. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

SIR,

I regret that my study of the relevant literature did not include the article in the Dominican organ *Blackfriars,* and I was thus unaware that the Dominicans had joined in the Jesuit onslaught upon the late Abbot Chapman. I admit that this justified Father Thurston's plural, and apologise if my interpretation of it seemed to him offensive. It will be necessary for me to examine Father Benet O'Driscoll's article before pronouncing whether it seems as unfair as Archbishop Goodier's attack. But this attack now seems to me even more regrettable, since it appears to have been concerted. Of course, I am no expert in mystical theology, but what is good enough for *The Dublin Review* is good enough for me, and Abbot Chapman's book helped me a great deal personally, as I am sure it has done many other people. Abbot Chapman himself said that all books should be read with caution; the 'Letters' may not be milk for babes; but do the Jesuits want to keep us on a milk diet all our days? It almost seems so.

And now may I return for one moment to Teresa Higginson? In a little paper called *The Messenger* for January last (the organ of the Jesuit 'Apostleship of Prayer,' and procured at the Church of the Holy Name), thanks are given for help 'after prayer to the Sacred Heart (*intercession of Teresa Higginson*).' Archbishop Goodier, in his second *Month* article, boasts of Jesuit obedience to the Holy See: 'If there was one thing that marked St. Ignatius, one thing which he impressed on his disciples so that it has become at once their stigma and their glory, it was that they should always be of one mind with the Church.'

Strange, then, that the Jesuits should speak of Teresa Higginson as if she were already beatified and endued with powers of intercession in Heaven! His Holiness, so far as is publicly known, had not yet spoken one word in her cause, and yet the Jesuits, those loyal sons of the Pope, seek to prejudge the matter and to treat the beatification as if it were already a *fait accompli*! This is what puzzles the onlooker. Why so much zeal for Teresa Higginson, and so much depreciation of Abbot Chapman? The natural conclusion, which no one can be blamed for drawing, is that the Jesuits prefer an unbalanced and mentally subnormal woman who makes for obedience, to a spiritually mature and highly cultivated scholar and saint who makes for emancipation.

J. C. HARDWICK.

The Vicarage, Partington.
4th July, 1936.

PERCY DEARMER.

SIR,

Will you allow me to add a small personal tribute to your 'In Memoriam' of the late Dr. Percy Dearmer, which it was a pleasure to read. I only knew him as a writer, but he had the happy knack of conveying a vital and inspiring personality through his writings. To take one example only, which you mention, his 'Lessons on the Way,' published some years ago. These are at once a scholarly and racy explanation of the Church Catechism, and full of delightful humour from beginning to end. It is no small achievement to make the Catechism thrilling! As one who has had much religious teaching of the young, I have often blessed Dr. Dearmer for those five small volumes. They deserve to be far more widely known. I echo your hope that they will be republished, so that others may benefit from them as I have done. He had a marvellous capacity for making dry bones live. Would that more of our Church leaders and teachers had his gift of making religious truths real to our old friend 'the man in the street.'

Kingston Vicarage, Corfe Castle.
June 22nd, 1936.

F. S. HORAN.